

History of Education Society

For the Honor and Glory of God: The Philadelphia Bible Riots of 1840

Author(s): Vincent P. Lannie and Bernard C. Diethorn

Source: *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Spring, 1968), pp. 44-106

Published by: History of Education Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/366986>

Accessed: 18/08/2010 16:25

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=hes>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



History of Education Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History of Education Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

For the Honor and Glory of God: The Philadelphia Bible Riots of 1840

VINCENT P. LANNIE
BERNARD C. DIETHORN

I

NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT. Francis Kenrick had his work cut out for him. It was 1830 and he had just been appointed as Coadjutor Bishop to Henry Conwell of Philadelphia. Conwell was in an enfeebled state of old age, truculent in spirit, and suspicious of his colleague's authority. The diocese of Philadelphia was badly disorganized because episcopal government was in a state of near collapse. There was no seminary or college, a single orphanage, few schools, and "a disheartened people." In particular, the problem of "trusteeism" had created religious havoc in the diocese during the 1820's. (1) A reserved, scholarly, and cautious person, Kenrick could not have found a less propitious vineyard in which to begin his episcopal career.

Born in Dublin in 1796, Kenrick grew up in an Ireland that denied Catholics many civil, economic, and religious rights. Through the influence of an uncle who was a priest, he received a good education at a Catholic academy and evidenced a desire to become a priest. A brilliant student, he was sent to Rome to pursue his studies for the priesthood. In such an international setting, Kenrick developed cosmopolitan attitudes that later would enable him to remain an Irish-American without any undue and aggressive attachment to his for-

Mr. Lannie is Associate Professor of Educational History at New York University; Mr. Diethorn is Assistant Professor of Education at Dayton University.

mer homeland. After he received a doctorate in theology and was ordained to the ministry in 1821, he volunteered his priestly services to the American missions. The Bishop of Bardstown, Kentucky, Benedict Flaget, needed a seminary professor and the new priest accepted the invitation. In addition to his seminary work, he engaged in the customary pastoral ministrations in the diocese. On several occasions, he debated different Protestant ministers on theological questions and won a reputation as a formidable Catholic apologist. These widely published controversies in addition to the need of a steady steward in Philadelphia brought him to the attention of the American hierarchy and led to his episcopal appointment in 1830. (2)

Although coadjutor to Conwell, the new Bishop was appointed to Philadelphia with full power of administration. Tall, well proportioned, and in the prime of life, he set about to rebuild the diocese from its chaotic state. He brought "trusteeism" to an arrest, built churches and organized a seminary, promulgated decrees to improve and sustain church life, and devoted attention to the question of education. In addition to being a good administrator, Kenrick was an able theologian who found time to write numerous volumes that were used regularly in American seminaries and cited frequently by European scholars. Probably the best Catholic theologian in the United States at the time, other bishops and writers often consulted him on moral questions and the subtleties of Church doctrine. In fact, the Archbishop of Baltimore, Samuel Eccleston, adopted Kenrick as his personal adviser and often took the morning train to Philadelphia to confer with him for a few hours. Kenrick also had the reputation of being a good politician with close friends in high ecclesiastical places. He certainly was held in high esteem in Rome. When Michael O'Connor, the future Bishop of Pittsburgh, praised Kenrick's episcopal work in the United States, a Roman Cardinal responded that his praise was not any "higher than the opinion the Sacred Congregation has had of this Prelate." (3)

A bishop with scholarly pursuits (a happy combination in any age), Kenrick took a keen interest in the progress of Catholic education in his diocese. Shortly after his appointment, he wrote to the Reverend John Hughes, a priest in Philadelphia and the future Bishop of New York, congratulating him for his educational efforts. "The enemies of our faith are no less sensible than we that their

calumnies cannot long gain credence if the infant mind be preserved from the infection of the nursery tales concerning Popery." (4) He quickly made the establishment of Catholic schools a priority not only in the city of Philadelphia but throughout the whole of the diocese. But he would establish schools only on a firm financial basis; and to this end he decreed in 1832 that "no orphan asylum, or school, under the care of the Sisters of Charity, or of other virgins dedicated to God, be established in this Diocese without our previous permission" (5) As with the case with other bishops of the time, students were in abundance but facilities were few and teaching personnel were scarce. His attempts to attract religious orders, especially of men, met with only limited success. "If we could establish the Christian Brothers here," Kenrick wrote dejectedly to his old Irish schoolmate and good friend, the Reverend Paul Cullen, "much good would doubtless be done, but they were unable to come" (6) As a result, the Catholic schools in operation were small in enrollment and were exclusively for girls. Thus, most Catholic children—and all the boys—attended the rapidly expanding system of public schools in Philadelphia. "[W]e are deplorably situated in respect to our young lads," declared one of Kenrick's assistants in a letter to Cullen. "They obtain their education entirely in the public schools, from which, however, generally all religious instruction is excluded, except the reading of the Bible." (7) Even Kenrick's encouragement of Catholic schools sponsored by laymen did not appreciably improve the overall situation. Like it or not, he was forced to be aware of the instruction given to Catholic children in the public schools of Philadelphia. Such a concern would embroil him in a storm of controversy with public school authorities and the Protestant majority, eventually culminating in the bloody riots of 1844.

II

Kenrick had been in Philadelphia just a few years when Pennsylvania inaugurated its public school system in 1834. The Constitution of 1790 had merely provided "for the establishment of schools throughout the state, in such manner that the poor may be taught gratis." This directive was implemented by subsequent laws that provided education for indigent children at county expense in

"neighborhood" and church schools. In 1818, Philadelphia County was authorized to establish Lancastrian public schools for the indigent, and this authorization was extended to other counties a few years later. As the growth of industrialization caused a corresponding growth in urban population, these counties needed additional educational facilities to complement the existing "neighborhood" and church schools. The Lancastrian system was seen as an inexpensive and corrective solution to the problem. But many people did not feel that such an arrangement fundamentally solved the problem of a common education in the state. The efforts of various workingmen's associations, memorials from the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Public Schools, and petitions from numerous citizen groups pressured the State Legislature in 1831 to authorize the accumulation of a \$2,000,000 fund for the support of a public school system. Three years later in 1834, with Governor George Wolfe's support and under the astute leadership of Samuel Breck, a Philadelphian and chairman of a Joint Committee on Education, the Legislature passed a Free School Act that established a state system of public instruction. All school districts that voted to tax themselves for the maintenance of public schools were allocated a share of the common school fund. Each district was required to raise through local taxation a sum of not less than twice the amount received from the state. The new school law affected Philadelphia County (School District Number One) only in that it received state tax support for the continuance of its Lancastrian system. But two years later, Thomas Burrowes, State Superintendent of Public Schools, threatened to withhold state funds from Philadelphia because he believed that the county's system of instruction was contrary to the spirit of the new school act. Moreover, many Philadelphians had never been totally satisfied with the quality of Lancastrian instruction or with the "indigent student" solution. Thus in 1837, Philadelphia announced that the "stigma of poverty" was no longer to be tolerated in the statute book and that "the schools of this city and county are now open to any child." (8)

The school law of 1834 made no mention about religion in the public schools. But the Bible had never been viewed as a sectarian book, and most schools had long opened their day with exercises that included the reading of a portion of the Scripture. In Philadelphia, teachers traditionally read the Bible "without note or comment" at

the beginning of each school day. No specific version had ever been mandated though the revered King James Bible was the one in general use. From the outset, however, the Philadelphia Board of Controllers of the public schools issued a series of resolutions in 1834 that further clarified the question of religion in the public schools. At one of the schools, a Catholic school director complained that he had found many copies of *A Life of Luther* which contained "a very base and abusive misrepresentation of the Catholic religion." In response to his protest, the controllers made it clear that since the entire citizenry paid taxes for the support of the schools, the introduction of "any religious or sectarian" instruction could not be permitted in these schools without violating the rights of a portion of the community. Nevertheless, some schools had managed to introduce "religious exercises" and "books of a religious character" into their school lessons. To prevent the proliferation of these practices and the transformation of the schools into sectarian institutions, the Board ordered discontinued at once "the introduction or use of any religious exercises, books, or lessons into the Public Schools" that it did not expressly authorize. (9) But this prohibition did not refer to Bible reading "without note or comment"; and neither Kenrick nor his coreligionists apparently found this practice to be particularly offensive to Catholic sensibilities. Indeed, the *Catholic Herald*, the official Catholic weekly of Philadelphia, insisted that "religion must be the foundation and the topstone of education." To this end, "the Bible should be studied more diligently than any other volume, and . . . the spirit of religion should pervade even the common school." (10) During the next several years, there were no Catholic complaints about the use of the Bible in the public schools.

But in 1838, the State Legislature passed a second school law that made the Bible a mandatory textbook in the public schools. In section five of the act, a clear directive was set forth concerning the use of the Bible in the schools: "The Old and New Testaments, containing the best extant code of morality, in simple, beautiful and pure language, shall be used as a school book for Reading, without comment by the Teacher, but not as a textbook for religious discussion." Under this law, no specific Biblical version was decreed (though the legislators no doubt had the King James version in mind) and the assumption was that no religious proselytism would occur during

the reading lessons. As a result of this legislation, therefore, the Bible would be used not only as part of the school's opening day exercises but now would become a school reader. It was one thing for teachers to read the Protestant Bible to their children, including Catholic pupils; it was quite another thing to force Catholic children to read a Biblical version that their parents and church refused to accept as the authoritative word of God. Though Philadelphia Catholics did not object to the former practice, they found this new change to be offensive to their religious scruples. Certainly the reappearance of Protestant activities in the public schools helped to sharpen Catholic dissatisfaction. (11)

The principal complainant was a letter writer to the *Catholic Herald* who corresponded under the pseudonym of "Sentinel". Although the author is not definitely known, he was probably Kenrick himself. In fact, he frequently wrote articles for the paper but never under his own name. Nor should it be forgotten that the sentinel of Catholic doctrine and practice in a diocese is always its bishop. Moreover, the editor of the *Catholic Herald* regularly supported "Sentinel" in his views and strategies for action. "Sentinel" complained that efforts were underway to introduce into the schools Sarah Hall's *Conversations on the Bible*, a book published by the Presbyterian-controlled Sunday School Union. He further objected to the new legislation that in effect forced Catholic children to read the King James Bible as a textbook. Since the Sunday School Union was essentially Presbyterian, Kenrick connected both efforts as a Presbyterian attempt to dominate public education. "Is it just to place the Protestant Bible in the hands of Catholic children, to make them commit its text to memory, and to respond to the questions which sectarian teachers may put as to its contents?" Under such adverse religious conditions, "Sentinel" favored the separation of religion from education—"unnatural [though] it may be"—in order to protect the faith of Catholic youngsters attending the public schools. He argued convincingly that the rights of conscience applied equally to "the children of unbelievers" as well as to Catholics. "Who should force on them the knowledge of revelation?" (12) The *Catholic Herald* supported "Sentinel" in his remarks and at the same time prodded pastors to make more strenuous efforts to secure a Catholic education for the boys of their parishes. Their parishioners no doubt would support their attempts

"to secure the rising Catholic generation from the deplorable effects of ignorance, or the still more deplorable effects of sectarian proselytism." But the *Herald* was realistic enough to recognize that there would never be a sufficient number of schools to meet the complete needs of the diocese. Therefore, it warned Catholics to keep a vigilant eye on the kind and extent of religious instruction in the public schools. (13)

A year later conditions had not changed and again "Sentinel" wrote to get some action. He urged the legislature to provide such legal injunctions so that public school authorities could "permit no books to be read in schools, save of a literary or scientific character, and . . . allow no religious exercise or instruction whatever." (14) Although the politically neutral *Public Ledger* recommended that the Bible be dropped as a textbook since "irreverent familiarity with the Bible often induces unbelief," the Episcopalian *Banner of the Cross* emphasized that moral duties could not be taught without reference to the divine law. The editor believed that his communion could never support a system of education which excludes the word of God from its classrooms. "[S]he holds that Christian morals are founded on Christian faith," concluded the paper in classical Protestant justification, "of which faith the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient rule to which all teaching must refer." (15)

Except for occasional editorial comments on the subject, the question of the Bible in the public schools of Philadelphia commanded no headlines during 1840 and most of 1841. Instead, both Protestants and Catholics focused their attention on the burning school controversy in New York City. Under the aggressive leadership of Bishop John Hughes, Catholics were locked in battle with the Public School Society which administered public education in the city. Although initially intent on making the public schools religiously acceptable for Catholic children, Hughes concluded that this could not be done and then appealed for public funds to help support his few schools. Philadelphia Catholics predictably supported Hughes' quest as reasonable and just while the Protestant press branded it as an attempt to establish a union of church and state. The struggle was not yet over and would reach its most bitter stage in 1842. But Kenrick kept his eye on New York since he felt that the outcome in the Empire City

would have a crucial bearing on the Philadelphia school situation. (16)

In June 1841, the *Catholic Herald* predicted that increased Presbyterian activity in the public schools called for greater vigilance on the part of Catholic parents. A few months later, "Sentinel" again took up his cudgel. He insisted that an effort was underway to "exercise the same influence on the minds of our children, which has called forth the praiseworthy resistance of our brothers in New York." Schools that were predominantly Catholic were still required to use the Protestant Bible. In a rather perceptive analysis of the presence of religion in public education, Kenrick branded nondenominationalism as essentially sectarianism. Even if the public schools did not follow the "peculiar hue of any particular sect of Protestants, it will necessarily be Protestant in its character. It is founded on a Protestant principle, it is managed chiefly by Protestants, and the books, even if free from direct invective against Catholics, which is not often the case, are all of a Protestant complexion." (17) To put it in another way, Kenrick denied the legitimacy of nondenominational Christianity in the public schools. When nondenominationalism was taught, sectarianism was taught regardless of the brand or the label. In this case nondenominationalism was the equivalent of Protestantism. The Bible was a case in point. Both Protestants and Catholics accepted the Bible as the word of God. But their agreement ended at this point. Protestants read several versions and believed in private interpretation while Catholics insisted upon an authorized version of the Bible approved by the authority of its hierarchical church. For Protestants, Bible reading in the public schools without any commentary was a religious act; for Catholics, this type of Scripture reading signified Protestant sectarianism. Kenrick went so far as to urge Catholic parents to remove their children from those public schools that used the Bible as a textbook and offered Protestant devotional exercises.

Such appeals did not escape the watchful eyes of a host of Protestant sentinels. In a letter to the Whig *North American*, "Justitia" cautioned the people of Pennsylvania to beware of an insidious papist plot to remove the Bible from the public schools. These "foreigners come here and dare trample on *our* Bible, and have the im-

udence to tell us that no *rule* of Faith, or no Bible, shall be tolerated." (18) The *Presbyterian* insisted that it was absolutely necessary for the Bible to "occupy the fundamental place in the school." (19) "Sentinel" responded that Catholics desired the same freedom of conscience that others claimed for themselves. Protestants could very well teach their Biblical precepts in their churches and meeting houses. But "they should not make so exceptional a version [King James] a portion of the public creed; nor should they at all unite religious instruction with public education, which in this case necessarily assumes a sectarian hue." (20)

During the early months of 1842, it became apparent that the more militant Catholics of Philadelphia desired some action concerning the school question. In a letter to the *Catholic Herald*, "Liber" urged every Catholic congregation to appoint delegates to an investigatory committee. Once the committee ascertained all the facts in the case (obviously from the Catholic viewpoint), it should approach the legislature for amendments to the present school system. (21) But "Sentinel" sharply disagreed with this suggestion. Not even a state body could prevent Catholic children from being shamed "out of their convictions." Moreover, most lawmakers would never risk "their popularity" with the Protestant majority by excluding the King James Bible from the public schools. That would be the easiest way to suffer political defeat and no politician relished such an eventuality. On the contrary, declared Kenrick, Catholics must seek "due execution of the law Redress, then, will be had without recourse to the legislature, and without any public or general movement of the Catholic community." (22) Kenrick obviously feared Protestant retaliation to the organization of any kind of Catholic pressure group. Conservative in approach and prudent by nature, he was certainly aware of Hughes' dramatic organization of a political party in the New York election just a few months earlier in November 1841. No doubt he read about the sharp criticism that descended upon Hughes for such a bold act. Most of the press concluded that here was conclusive proof that the Catholic Church hoped to gain political control of the country. The "mask" was off as Catholics sought to unite church and state. "The foot of the Beast was trampling on the elective franchise, and His High Priest [Hughes] was standing before the *ballot box*, the citadel of American liberties, dictating to

his obedient followers the ticket they must vote." (23) No, Kenrick would have none of this. He would never sanction such a precipitous action in his diocese. Such public demonstrations accomplished nothing for Catholics and only hindered their attempts to gain what they considered to be justice and fair play.

But "Liber" felt that the Bishop was not militant enough. Public demonstrations were needed to protest the religious abuses in the public schools. The law would never be enforced and parental prohibition of Bible reading in the schools was ineffective. After all, Catholics could not threaten the removal of their children from the public schools when there were not sufficient Catholic schools as replacements. Yes, demonstrations were needed to publicize Catholic dissatisfaction with public education. For "Liber" did not expect Catholics to "rise up spontaneously and contribute a sufficient amount of funds to meet all the wants of the children thus thrown on their hands." (24) The Catholics of Philadelphia needed a spirited leadership, and Kenrick alone was in the position to furnish it. Kenrick again rejected this call, and the *Catholic Herald* sustained his contention that public agitation would "retard" eventual success. Instead, the paper urged the "speedy erection of school houses attached to our churches." Of course, the editor knew that his suggestion could not be implemented immediately. The millenium had not quite arrived! Until a sufficient number of Catholic schools could be built, he counseled Catholics to be on guard lest the religious rights of their children be infringed upon in the public schools. Whenever a violation was found, the *Catholic Herald* declared in sentiments that echoed Kenrick, "let a complaint be lodged and an investigation demanded, and so keep before the public eye the grievance and injustice against which Catholics are struggling, and not be a tame or silent acquiescence on the part of the parents which seems to sanction its continuance." (25)

Although Kenrick was inclined to less dramatic methods, he pursued the same pragmatic approach employed by other American bishops with regard to the school question. They attempted to make the public schools religiously acceptable to Catholic children until they were able to build and maintain parish schools to meet their needs. Hughes may have been more energetic in his approach, but Kenrick sought the same end. The *Banner of the Cross* quickly applauded the

Catholic Herald's appeal for Catholic schools. The construction of religious schools was an excellent solution to the Catholic educational problem. "Protestants are disposed to respect their [Catholic] rights," declared the editor somewhat smugly, "and only ask that their own be not invaded." (26) After all, Protestants had a right to include Bible reading, recitation of prayers, and singing of hymns in schools that were essentially their creation. The *Catholic Herald* did not wait long to answer in a sarcastic vein. The *Banner of the Cross* was congratulated for allowing Catholics to erect their own schoolhouses and at the same time contribute to the general school tax. "Generous, condescending Protestantism, ever ready to sacrifice others at the shrine of Religious Liberty." (27)

Catholic pupils were not the only ones intimidated in the public schools. On several occasions, Kenrick charged that Catholic teachers were threatened with dismissal if they hesitated to "read the Protestant Bible to their pupils, and see that it is in their hands." Then in April 1842, a teacher was fired for refusing to read the King James version to her students. Employed for six years in a school in the Southwark district, she was suspended from her duties and released from her position. Even though Southwark housed a large number of Catholic residents, the local school board was determined to enforce Protestant Bible reading in all of its district schools. Thus, the dismissal of this teacher was in reality a test case. As soon as it became clear that the Philadelphia Board of Controllers would take no action to reinstate her, even "Sentinel" conceded that the time had come for some kind of Catholic demonstration in her defense. "Is it not incumbent on the inhabitants of Southwark generally, and especially Catholics," suggested Kenrick in a mild appeal for action, "to express in some way their disapprobation of this infringement on the rights of conscience, and to take measures to see that the religious predilections of parents, whose children are now forced to read the Protestant version, should be respected?" Neither Protestant nor Catholic heeded "Sentinel's" call and a week later he repeated his plea. He reminded his coreligionists that unless they made known their displeasure at this time, Catholics would no longer be permitted to teach in the public schools. (28)

As all these issues became more critical and more divisive, inevitably they found their way into the classrooms by means of inex-

cusable incidents. Many Catholic parents forbade their children to read the King James Bible in the schools. They dutifully obeyed their parents and accordingly suffered petty persecutions in the classroom. One child was whipped before the class for refusing to read the Protestant Bible. Others were kept after school as punishment. Another child was reprimanded for bringing the Douay Bible to class. Children were humiliated because of their religious faith and ethnic background by some teachers in front of their fellow students. The *Catholic Herald* condemned such acts in its columns and demanded simple justice for Catholic children. But the editor was not too surprised that "persecution" had entered the classrooms when the *Baptist Record* could endorse the advice of the *Protestant Banner*: "Protestants must be on the alert, and guard against the assaults of papists on our free institutions in time." If the Bible was to remain in the public schools, then it was important for citizens to select school officers who believed in the Bible and supported its place in the schools. There was no subtlety in the paper's appeal. Protestant citizens were urged to vote only for Protestant school commissioners and directors as a means of retaining the Bible in the schools. If this advice were not followed, an eventual Catholic take-over of the schools would be the dire consequence. "If the priests succeed in erecting the cross of antichrist over our common school houses, they will have gained a triumph which every Christian and philanthropist will deplore." (29)

It seems clear that most Philadelphia Catholics were not as concerned about the religious conditions in the public schools as was Kenrick. They ignored their Bishop's call to action and wrote few letters in support of his position. Somewhat disappointed at such Catholic apathy, Kenrick decided not to pursue this method of protest. He made no public statements and "Sentinel" did not communicate with the *Catholic Herald*. Perhaps he hoped that conditions would improve if Catholics complained less and presented a more positive image to the community. School conditions did not improve, however, but became more aggravated during the autumn months. Catholic children were still required to read the King James Bible and were increasingly subjected to teacher harassment. Nor had Kenrick forgotten the teacher-firing episode. Finally in November 1842, he composed a careful statement which cataloged Catholic dissatisfac-

tion with public education and submitted it to the Board of Controllers for consideration and action. As spiritual leader of Catholic Philadelphia, Kenrick believed that he had a solemn obligation to protect Catholic rights and inform the controllers of Catholic objections to the public schools. Although he expressed a deep sense of sympathy for the Catholic teacher who was removed from her position, her plight received minor attention among more crucial priorities. Rather he concentrated on Bible reading and other religious exercises in the schools. With regard to the regulations then prevalent in the public schools, he examined each one of them in some detail:

Among them I am informed one is that the teachers shall read and cause to be read, The Bible; by which is understood the version published by command of King James. To this regulation we are forced to object, inasmuch as Catholic children are thus led to view as authoritative a version which is rejected by the Church. It is not expected that I should state in detail the reasons of this rejection. I shall only say that several books of Divine Scripture are wanting in that version and that the meaning of the original text is not faithfully expressed. It is not incumbent on us to prove either position, since we do not ask you to adopt the Catholic version for general use; but we feel warranted in claiming that our conscientious scruples to recognize or use the other, be respected. In Baltimore the Directors of the Public Schools have thought it their duty to provide Catholic children with the Catholic version. Is it too much for us to expect the same measure of justice?

The consciences of Catholics are also embarrassed by the mode of opening and closing the School exercises which, I understand, is by the singing of some hymn, or by prayer. It is not consistent with the laws and discipline of the Catholic Church for her members to unite in religious exercises with those who are not of their communion. We offer up prayers and supplications to God for all men; we embrace all in the sincerity of Christian affection; but we confine the marks of religious brotherhood to those who are of the household of the faith. Under the influence of this conscientious scruple, we ask that the Catholic children be not required to join in the singing of hymns or other religious exercises.

I have been assured that several of the books used in the public schools, and still more those contained in the libraries attached to them, contain misrepresentations of our tenets and statements to our prejudice, equally groundless and injurious. It is but just to expect that the books used in the schools shall contain no offensive matter, and the books decided (sic) hostile to our faith shall not under any pretext be placed in the hands of Catholic children.

The School law which provides that 'the religious predilections of the parents shall be respected,' was evidently framed in the spirit of our

Constitution, which holds the rights of conscience to be inviolable. Public education should be conducted on principles which will afford its advantages to all classes of the community, without detriment to their conscientious convictions. Religious liberty must be especially guarded in children, who of themselves, are unable to guard against the wiles or assaults of others. I appeal then, Gentlemen, with confidence to your justice that the regulations of the schools may be modified so as to give the Catholic pupils and teachers, equal rights, without wounding tender consciences. (30)

What Kenrick argued against was the Protestant orientation of the public schools of his time: the use of Protestant versions of the Bible, Protestant hymns and prayers, anti-Catholic text and library books, and in general the Protestant pervasiveness of public education in pre-Civil War America.

It is perfectly clear that Kenrick did not urge the exclusion of the King James Bible from the public schools as nativists claimed and were to use as a rallying cry for their political organizations in Philadelphia. Kenrick asked that the Catholic Bible be used by Catholic children and the Protestant Bible be read by Protestant children. But Bible reading was only one Catholic complaint against the public schools. He wanted Catholic children excused from all devotional prayers and hymns since such exercises were essentially Protestant worship services. Kenrick realized that his requests placed the Board of Controllers in a difficult position. Therefore, he reminded the Board that Baltimore had already permitted children the right to use the Catholic Bible in the public schools. Here was certainly a precedent for Philadelphia to emulate; here was the political "out" that Kenrick offered the Controllers. In short, Kenrick argued that nothing be taken from Protestant school children but that Catholic children be allowed a different religious option in the public schools.

At its regular meeting in December, the Board of Controllers referred Kenrick's communication to a seven-man committee for study and recommendations. A month later, January 1843, the committee reported two resolutions for adoption by the Board:

RESOLVED, that no children be required to attend or unite in the reading of the Bible in the Public Schools, whose parents are conscientiously opposed thereto:

RESOLVED, that those children whose parents conscientiously prefer and desire any particular version of the Bible, without note or comment, be furnished with the same.(31)

With regard to Catholic complaints about hymn singing, prayer recitation, and allegedly anti-Catholic text and library books, the committee felt that the proper enforcement of the Board's regulations would "prevent any difficulty that may occur on that score." Nevertheless, they would be prepared to consider specific objections to specific textbooks used in the schools. The committee also hoped that local boards of directors would use prudence in the selection of books for school libraries. No mention was made about the status of Catholic teachers who refused to read the King James Bible to their students. But neither was Kenrick very explicit or adamant on this question. He expressed sympathy for the Catholic teacher who had been fired but did not demand any specific redress. Most important to Catholics, however, the committee agreed to excuse Catholic children from reading the King James Bible if their parents objected to this practice. Now any Bible could be used as long as it was "without note or comment." Other Protestant versions could be used since none of them included any explanatory notes. But the Catholic Douay Bible contained the very notes and comments prohibited by the resolutions. Therefore, in practice the Catholic version remained excluded from the public schools. Obviously, Kenrick knew that the Douay Bible included annotated comments, and certainly the Board of Controllers was aware of this fact. Such knowledge was probably reflected in the Board's vote on the resolutions offered for adoption. No opposition was offered to the first resolution while the second and more controversial one was approved by a vote of twelve to seven. This negative vote no doubt reflected the opposition of the Catholic members who felt that the resolution was too restrictive as well as of those Protestant controllers who represented a hard position and believed that it was too liberal a concession.

Reaction to the Board's resolutions was quick in coming. Kenrick believed the Board's action to be a compromise measure, which was exactly what it was. He was satisfied that Catholic children would not have to read the King James Bible but was disappointed that the Douay version was excluded from the schools by the phrase "without note or comment." Surely the Board knew that "Catholic discipline requires that the version be accompanied with notes taken from the Fathers and other approved sources." He even believed that the liberal spirit of the resolutions would safeguard the rights of

Catholic teachers. And he decided that he would not pursue his fight for the Douay Bible in the schools since Catholics were "too fond of peace to moot the matter." But he would continue to complain about religious exercises which continued in some public schools, and he called for an immediate investigation of such alleged practices in the school on Zane Street. (32)

Most of the Protestant press that condemned Kenrick's letter also took sharp exception to the Board of Controllers' resolutions. They considered the whole affair as a Catholic device to exclude the Bible from the schools and undermine the Christian, that is Protestant, and republican institutions of the United States. The *North American* accused Kenrick of trying to "ride over the cause of Protestantism and possibly of free principles in the United States." But more to the heart of the matter, the editor maintained that Catholics were deliberately interfering with public schools that were essentially and rightly Protestant:

For years and years the schools have been in operation, planned by Protestants, founded by Protestants, directed by Protestants, and almost wholly supported by Protestants, and now come 'the Bishop of New York [Hughes]' and 'the Bishop of Philadelphia [Kenrick]' to interfere in the management of them, create confusion within their walls and 'excitement' without. In this they have succeeded admirably. Who would have believed their victory would have been so easy? Let us look to it. (33)

The *Presbyterian* rejected the Catholic appeal to "rights of conscience" since most Americans wanted Protestant public schools and since Catholics were not forced to attend these schools. In a republican country, it was a well-known fact that the majority always rules and that the minority must accept the majority decision. After this brief lesson in political philosophy, the editor applied it to the public schools in a vein almost identical to the *North American's* position:

Protestants founded these schools, and they have always been in a majority; why then should the minority who have come in afterwards for the benefits of these schools, regard the most vital principle entering into their constitution as an infringement of their rights? Were the Roman Catholics forced to send their children to these schools, their complaints would be well grounded; but there is no compulsion; they act in the full knowledge of the facts, and should not therefore complain. (34)

The *Presbyterian* also warned the Board of Controllers not to go too

far in its quest for religious liberality in the schools. Would the Controllers, for example, acquiesce to a similar petition by Jews, asked the editor in mock inquiry, and "expunge Christianity from the public school system" by excluding the New Testament? If such an incredible eventuality should ever occur, he advocated dissolving public education and allowing "each denomination . . . to instruct its own children." (35) In like manner, the Presbyterian *Christian Observer* dismissed Catholic appeals to conscience as "ridiculous and farcical." Such an argument was just a subterfuge for more nefarious purposes. It was common knowledge that Kenrick, "an accomplished tactician," opposed the Bible in the public schools and intended "to subvert the foundation of our civil and religious institutions." (36) The *Baptist Record* thought that Kenrick's demand for the removal of the Bible from the schools was no different from the earlier demands of Deists at the beginning of the century. (37) The *Episcopal Recorder*, the organ of evangelical Episcopalianism, indicated its sympathies by printing an address of the Reverend B. Cheever, a noted "no popery" lecturer. Pursuing the common theme of the indivisibility of American republicanism and Protestant Christianity, Cheever warned that if a single generation of young people grew up without a Bible education, even though well grounded in secular knowledge, the Christian institutions of the country would be destroyed forever. (38)

The *Catholic Herald* maintained a rather diplomatic silence in the face of this harsh editorial criticism. A shrewd man, Kenrick expected such unfavorable reaction; a basically cautious man, he had no intention of adding any fuel to the fire of controversy. And after all, the Board of Controllers did accede to his request in part. But he did respond to the allegation that the public schools were basically Protestant institutions. He reminded Philadelphia Protestants that a large number of prominent Catholic citizens had played an important role in the establishment of the state public school system in 1834. Nor did he forget to mention that "Catholics pay their full quota of the taxes by which these schools are supported . . ." (39) In response to this Protestant-Catholic bickering, the *Literary Age*, a Philadelphia literary magazine, pronounced a secular plague on both religious houses. All the furor about the role of the Bible in the schools and the appropriate version militated against "good order and good

feeling" in the schools and would ultimately impair their effectiveness. The editor predicted that as long as the Bible remained in the schools there would always be religious controversy of one kind or another. As a result, he recommended that the Scriptures be excluded "altogether from our system of scholastic instruction, with which they have no legitimate connection." (40) None of the other press commented on this suggestion. Although Protestants in general would have reprobated such a secularistic proposal, Kenrick probably would not have been adverse to it. Not that he believed that education should be divorced from religion. But in the practical situation of place and time, it would have removed the Protestant Bible from the schools. Such an action would safeguard the religious rights of Catholic children in these schools. And he was all in favor of that.

III

In order to awaken Protestants to the dangers of Catholicism and specifically to oppose Kenrick's school demands, over eighty ministers from every denomination in Philadelphia founded the American Protestant Association in late 1842. Its constitution promised enlightened instruction on the differences between Protestantism and Catholicism, a more extensive distribution of the Bible, and an increased circulation of books and tracts designed to expose the errors of popery. The leaders of the Association believed that all Protestants, regardless of their doctrinal differences, agreed on the necessity of the Bible in American life and as an infallible guide to religious faith and practice. Since the growing strength of American Catholicism was viewed as a national threat, the Association listed a catalog of Romanist sins that were particularly dangerous to the integrity of the country:

While Romanism is establishing its proselytizing schools throughout the land, to pervert the tender minds of our youth; and directing its efforts to destroy the religious character and influence of public Protestant education; and organizing itself under a foreign priesthood, for direct interference with our political elections; and publishing and circulating the most opprobrious assaults upon the doctrines of our Protestant faith; and segregating its adherents into a distinct body, alien in sympathy and interest from the mass of the American people; a large portion of our Protestant citizens, who might with care arrest the progress of these

evils, seem unwilling even to be apprized of these evils, and instead of opposing them, actually contribute of their funds to maintain Popish churches, Asylums, and Seminaries, and commit their children to the tutelage of Popish priests and nuns. (41)

The Association met with no sympathy from most of the secular press of the city. While most of the Protestant press lauded the aims of the Association, the *Banner of the Cross* characterized it as " 'much ado about nothing' " and the *Catholic Herald* pictured it as "still-born." (42) But the Association grew in numbers and in influence. Its monthly lectures drew such large audiences that by the end of 1843 it instituted a series of weekly lectures to replace the monthly ones.

Nor was the American Protestant Organization the only one established in Philadelphia at this time. A year later the call went out to form another organization similiar in tone and purpose. Infuriated by Irish political activity, irritated by the role of immigrant labor during the depression years of the late 1830's and early 1840's, and inflamed by an anti-Catholic press and pulpit, many nativists now saw the issue of Bible reading in the public schools as a *cause célèbre* around which to rally supporters. Organized in December 1843, the American Republican Association quickly acquired a large membership and, by the following March, it had local units in every ward in Philadelphia and its surrounding suburbs. Not too different from other nativist organizations in its objectives, it urged a twenty-one-year residency requirement for all foreigners, the exclusion of naturalized citizens from all public offices, and the rejection of any union of church and state. Since the Bible was essential to the well-being of the country and the national morality, it was important that children be exposed to its salutary lessons in their formative years. And the best place for such exposure was in the public schools. To emphasize this point, the American Protestant Organization circulated posters throughout the city which denied that the Bible without note or comment was a sectarian book and proclaimed that it was "the fountainhead of morality and all good government, and should be used in our Public Schools as a reading book." (43)

Both the American Protestant Association and the American Republican Association kept the Bible issue before the public through lectures, pulpit oratory, press accounts, and debates. The "no popery"

crusade was in full swing in Philadelphia, and the school question, as it had been just a short time before in New York, was an essential ingredient. A sermon by the Reverend Walter Colton especially helped to light "the ready magazine of wrath." A Congregational minister who was a naval chaplain and a former editor of the *North American*, Colton lectured in many of the Presbyterian, Reformed, and Baptist churches on the "Bible in Our Public Schools." Printed in pamphlet form, this lecture was widely distributed throughout the city and presented gratis to every public school teacher. Essentially a reply to Kenrick's arguments in his letter to the Board of Controllers, it was a rehash of all the standard Protestant objections to the Catholic Church. Since the Roman Church opposed the reading of the Scriptures, Kenrick's real purpose was the exclusion of the Bible from the public schools. The King James Bible was not sectarian since all Protestants agreed upon this version. Catholics were not opposed to this version as much as they were to the use "of the Bible altogether." Kenrick's objection to devotional hymns was a "grotesque phantom of the mind" just as his complaint against school prayer "disparages and dishonors its source." Colton charged that the majority of Catholics were satisfied with the public schools. Only the Bishop, who received his orders from Rome, complained about religious conditions in the schools. Now was the time, concluded Colton, for Catholics to free themselves from ecclesiastical slavery and unite with Protestants "against these aggressions of the great Papal Hierarchy." (44)

Kenrick considered Colton's pamphlet a project of the American Protestant Association. If it did not directly finance the printing of the pamphlet, it certainly lent its support in circulating it. Once again, Kenrick attempted to answer such charges and restate the Catholic position. He never sought the exclusion of the King James version from the public schools but only that Catholic children not be obliged to read it. "It is a sectarian version, and rejected by Catholics, whose religious predilections must be respected, according to the terms of the law." Moreover, the children of Philadelphia were not sent to school "to learn religion, nor to practice it." It is evident that Kenrick's patience was starting to wear thin for he engaged in a rare outburst of sarcasm. "The Protestant Association will take charge of our youth, and provide them with a Bible, hymns and

prayers, according to their judgment, and we must sit down contented, and be silent, if not grateful. They may afterwards provide us with a national religion, when we shall have been prepared for the blessing, by means of a National Protestant education." (45)

Even before Kenrick's acidic response to Colton's lecture, the Board of Controllers took cognizance of the potentially explosive character of the minister's remarks. The resolutions of 1834 and 1843 were published immediately in the press "as this matter has become a subject of inquiry." Once these documents were published, Kenrick again took to his pen to criticize what he considered to be an increasingly temporizing position of the Board. And he struck further at the controllers. The Board's ruling concerning Bible reading with no explanatory comments was a "virtual adoption of the Protestant principle . . . of faith" and was the "assumption of a sectarian basis for public education." Despite this gross injustice, Catholics would not complain as long as their children did not have to read the Protestant Bible. But he did not retreat from what he considered to be a question of simple equity. If Protestants could read the King James Bible in the schools, why could not Catholics use their version? He did not force this argument though he could not understand why Protestants objected to it so strenuously. To the response that the Douay Bible was annotated with notes and comments, Kenrick offered this solution: "If the Controllers, or Directors wish the Bible to be read, let it be optional with the teacher or child, to use either version. Let it be forbidden to read comments or notes in School or to give comments, but let not our version be excluded, by requiring that there be no note or comment to the book itself." Catholics asked for no more than "JUSTICE, FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, [and] EQUAL RIGHTS," and Kenrick insisted that they would "persevere in demanding" them. (46)

No doubt that Kenrick was losing his patience with his Protestant fellow citizens and the Board in particular. His scholarly mind saw only logic in his position and found it difficult to understand objections to it. As a result, Kenrick became sharper with his pen, impatient with procrastination, and disgusted with nativist charges. But unlike Hughes in New York who was quick to leap into action, including the formation of a political party to prosecute Catholic demands, Kenrick was a more circumspect man who attempted to avoid

discord at all cost. He was ready to compromise on the question of the Bible in the schools even though he felt that it was a denial of justice to Catholics. Although Catholics should be allowed to read the Douay Bible in the public schools, he would not press the issue if they would be excused from using the King James version. This was not justice but it was better than nothing. And Catholics were in no position to demand everything! So he compromised.

IV

Another incident involving a teacher occurred in early 1844 and caused the educational situation in Philadelphia to deteriorate further. On the last day of February, Henry Moore, a school director of the Kensington district, addressed a large group of citizens in a Methodist church. In an excited tone, he informed his audience that Hugh Clark, a fellow director and a Catholic, had ordered Louisa Bedford, the principal teacher of the school, to stop reading the Protestant Bible to her pupils. Miss Bedford had refused, preferring to give up her teaching position. Moore ascribed Clark's action to "Popish dictations" and appealed to "American Protestant citizens to resist such attempts 'to kick the Bible from the Public Schools.'" Moore demanded Clark's resignation and resolved that Miss Bedford be commended for her courage in resisting such a directive. (47) When Clark heard the charge against him, he offered a different version of the story. While on a visitation to the school in question, Miss Bedford told him that disorder occurred regularly in the classroom when Catholic children withdrew before she commenced reading the King James Bible. Miss Bedford said that she did not know how to end such confusion and that this was a cause of some distress to her. Thereupon, Clark suggested "that it would perhaps be the better course to desist for a season from having the Bible read; and as I had been very annoyed by constant complaints by Catholic parents in respect to the matter, to end the difficulties until some action of the Board of Directors, I would assume the responsibility of having the exercises omitted." He denied that he had made disparaging remarks about the King James Bible, though he had intimated that the inclusion of the Douay version in the school would preclude the necessity of Catholic children leaving the classroom during the Bible reading

exercise. However, he never advised that his suggestion "should be thus employed." In order to maintain effective discipline in the classroom, Clark observed that Bible reading be curtailed altogether or that Scriptural versions be used to satisfy both Protestants and Catholics. Upon investigation of the matter, the local school board sustained Clark's contention that he had not forced his viewpoint on the teacher in question. In fact, Miss Bedford testified that Clark never urged her to discontinue Bible reading but simply that he had said he would take responsibility for such an action if she so decided upon it. In his own testimony, Moore admitted that it was Miss Bedford who decided to "dispense with the use of the Bible than have such confusion." But Moore asserted that such an action would never have his consent and he so informed Miss Bedford and his fellow director. (48)

Although the Kensington School Board cleared Clark of any wrongdoing in the matter, it reaffirmed the right of every principal teacher "to read or cause to be read" the Bible "without note or comment" at the opening exercises of the school day. But the Board wished to remove any element of coercion in this regard. To this end, it excused from such exercises all children whose parents forbade such attendance or who found it "contrary to their own inclination and desire." (49) The *Presbyterian* branded the Board's report as temporizing and denounced the choice given to children. The editor expressed shock that children should decide whether or not to participate in Bible reading exercises and quoted with approval the *North American's* understanding of such an option: "It is virtually saying to the children of a public school . . . : you may run out of the house whenever the Bible shall be introduced." The *Presbyterian* branded this "determined attempt to exclude . . . all semblance of religious instruction" from the schools as an attempt to placate Kenrick and the Catholic clergy. If such efforts eventually became successful, the paper recommended the destruction of the public school system. "The sooner the whole system is leveled to the dust, the better for the common weal." Since the removal of the Bible from the schools would convert them into "infidel" institutions, it was best that the system be abolished. For "in the hands of the infidels and corrupt politicians," it would "be converted into an instrument of infinite mischief

to the public." (50) "Let Protestant Christians, American Christians, awake to the crisis," warned the *Episcopal Recorder*, "and consider the duty which is before them." Catholic power was fast growing in the United States, and the paper depicted the menacing situation confronting all Protestants:

Are we to yield our personal liberty, our inherited rights, our very Bibles, the special, blessed gift of God to our country, to the will, the ignorance, or the wickedness of these hordes of foreigners, subjects of a foreign despot...? We have yielded to Papists, as citizens, already too much, for vain is their assurance of the separation between their civil and their religious obedience, while they bring the latter continually, to excuse and cover their disregard for the former. (51)

Catholics were considered as subjects of a foreign ecclesiastical power intent upon subverting the inherited rights of Protestants by removing the King James Bible from the public schools. Of course, there was a premise for such a statement. Protestantism and Americanism were inextricably related while Catholicism was identified with foreign despotism and thus beyond the scope of such a national alliance. For the most part, Catholics were foreigners who were under the domination of a foreign ecclesiasticism whose loyalty centered in Rome. In America they were a minority group and should be satisfied with their minority status. And this included not rocking the public school boat.

Several public meetings were held to protest the Clark incident and to "save the Bible" in the schools. On March 4, a protest meeting was held in Kensington where it was resolved to hold a mass rally a week later at Independence Square. The religious papers promoted a large attendance and many ministers "tuned their pulpits" to ensure a good turn-out. A crowd of about six thousand people gathered at the Square and agreed to petition the legislature for the direct election of city and county school officials. The expressed purpose of this resolution was to assure Protestant control of the public schools. During the course of the rally, several ministers presented impassioned speeches supporting the Bible in the schools and denouncing the wickedness of Romanism. The Reverend Joseph Berg accused the Papacy of "five distinct charges," while the Reverend James Burrows insinuated that Catholics had set his church on fire. The Reverend

William McCalla insisted that the Bible always remain in the schools, and the Reverend A. D. Gillett concluded the meeting by asking his audience to join in the singing of this verse:

Should all the forms that men devise,
Assault my faith with treacherous art,
I'd call them vanities and lies,
And bind the Bible to my heart! (52)

This meeting was in fact sponsored by the American Protestant Association, and the size of the crowd indicated popular interest over the question of the Bible in the public schools. The *Philadelphia Gazette* remarked that "the proceedings were marked by extraordinary earnestness" and predicted that "no half way measures will allay the excitement." (53)

In an attempt to clarify the Catholic position and quell the growing excitement, Kenrick issued a public statement the day following the meeting. It was printed in many of the daily newspapers and posted prominently throughout the city. Catholics wished to preserve the public schools from all sectarian influences and asked for the enforcement of existing school regulations. Catholics never sought to exclude the Bible from the schools and asked only "the liberty of using the Catholic version" in those schools that prescribed such exercises. Kenrick believed that his pronouncement was a peaceful substitute for any mass meeting of Catholics to prosecute their claims. Indeed, Catholics had no desire to intensify public feeling on the subject but merely advocated "LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE" for all citizens. (54) On the same day that he published his statement, Kenrick sent a private communication to the Board of Controllers asking that school officials and teachers heed and enforce the legislation pertaining to religion in the public schools. In this letter, Kenrick adopted a harder line than before. Previously, he did not wish to exclude the King James version from the schools as long as Catholics were not forced to read from its pages. But if Catholic children had to read the Scriptures, then he demanded that they use the Douay version. "I do not object to the use of the Bible provided Catholic children be allowed to use their own version." But he knew that the Catholic Bible was excluded from the schools because it included annotated notes explaining the text. Therefore, either Catholic children not be required to use the Protestant Bible or all Scripture reading

be removed from the schools. No other alternative was offered by the Bishop. (55)

In addition to Kenrick's letter, the Board of Controllers received a memorial signed by nearly fifty prominent Catholic laymen that supported Kenrick's school position. Stung by the charge that Kenrick alone was dissatisfied with the religious conditions in the public schools and no doubt prodded by the Bishop himself, the laymen reiterated complaints about Bible reading, the singing of hymns and offering of prayers, and added an additional example of a sectarian practice—the recitation of the Protestant version of the Ten Commandments. They noted that the words "without note or comment" effectively prohibited the Catholic Bible from the schools and challenged the practice which deprived Catholic teachers from becoming principal teachers because they refused to read the King James version. Invoking the authority of the Pennsylvania Constitution, the memorial urged a strict enforcement of the resolutions of 1834 and 1843 and suggested that teachers and pupils be allowed to use any Biblical version with no commentary to be offered by the teacher. (56)

At the Board's monthly meeting, several motions to have the entire question of religion in the public schools examined by a special committee were "indefinitely postponed." Instead, the controllers judiciously voted to send copies of the resolutions of 1834 and 1843 to all sectional boards and principal teachers and warned teachers that disregard of these instructions would result in the loss of their employment. Obviously, the Board wished to avoid any whole-scale investigation of the question, fearing public recrimination and inflammation. Thus, they attempted to meet Catholic objections in part without simultaneously alienating the Protestant majority. In an attempt at compromise, the controllers retained the King James version in the schools but did not force Catholic children or teachers to read it. If a principal teacher could not in conscience use the King James Bible, she could ask a colleague to read it in her place. As a result, Catholic teachers could now become principal teachers and still retain their religious integrity. But the Douay version was still not permitted in the schools. This meant that Catholic children did not have to participate in public school Bible reading and engaged in none of the other religious exercises in vogue. In effect, Catholic

children received only a secular education. Kenrick was not pleased with such a situation but it was better than a Protestant education. And he repeated this judgment on several occasions.

Several days after the Board met, three thousand native Americans, a popular name for members of the American Republican Association, met in Independence Square—again to protest against the removal of the Bible from the public schools. Several speakers connected Kenrick's maneuvers in Philadelphia with Hughes' agitation in New York. Perhaps a Catholic conspiracy was in the offing. Indeed, American Protestants should not be surprised at these episcopal machinations of an "arrogant" foreign priesthood. Nor would Kenrick, Hughes, and other Catholic instigators be satisfied to exclude the Bible from the public schools. On the contrary, they wished to banish any book "which declares that the Church of Rome has cruelly persecuted men on account of their religious belief and opinion." But Catholics were warned that Protestants would not permit them "to trample our free Protestant institutions in the dust." A special committee was appointed to remind the Board of Controllers of the rightful place of the Bible in the public schools regardless of demands made by a "foreign priest." (57) The Board made no specific response to this committee. However, its *Annual Report* for 1844 documented its efforts to keep sectarianism from the schools and to ensure a common religious liberty guaranteed by the state constitution. The Board had never contemplated the removal of the Bible from the schools nor had it ever received such a request from any person or religious group. During the past years, it had passed resolutions to prevent the entry of sectarian practices in the schools. But the Bible "has ever remained on the same basis on which it was placed at the first organization of our system [of public schools]." (58) The Board of Controllers was caught in the middle of a religious conflict and had no intention of going fully one way or the other.

Most of the Protestant press wanted the Board to go the whole way and ignore Catholic protests. The traditional and tiring argument was that the Catholic attempt to exclude the Bible from the public schools aimed "a blow at the republican institutions and liberties of our country." Since Protestantism was equated with American republicanism and Catholicism with foreign despotism, the Protestant majority simply could not tolerate such a possibility. "Let the public

Speak out in town meetings, and let the Protestant voters of Pennsylvania resolve that they will not pay taxes to support Popish schools, for such will be our schools when the Bible is a branded and condemned book. We repeat and we will continue to repeat our views, that rather than this, the whole present system of public schools should be utterly abolished." (59)

But some Protestants harbored fears that transcended their hostility to Catholics and the Douay Bible. Yes, they knew Catholics feared to read the Bible; yes, they realized that Catholics posed a threat to American liberty; yes, they believed that Catholics wished to gain control of the public schools. But there was another consideration that worried some Protestants and periodically came out in print. On several occasions, the *Presbyterian* alluded to this matter. The editor believed that the Catholic Bible, especially with its annotated comments, would never be introduced into the public schools. He felt that two Biblical versions in the same school would cause confusion in the minds of children. "Are we to teach the children that there are two Bibles?" Of course not, reasoned the Protestant mind, for Protestant children could never be taught that the Douay version was on the same religious plane with the King James Bible. That Catholics should apply the same reasoning to their position seemed unreasonable. This was a Protestant country, after all, and Catholics constituted a religious minority who enjoyed minority rights. But if Catholics persisted in their demands to include their Bible in the schools, confusion and disorder would quickly attend Bible reading exercises. And it was "clear that before this will be done, the Bible will be excluded altogether." Catholics would not be unhappy at such a consequence since "it is manifest that their whole aim is to exclude the Bible altogether." Although many Protestants suspected Catholic motives in this area, it is clear that they also worried, perhaps not always on the conscious level, about the consequences of such Catholic agitation. For if Catholics had their way, no Bible reading or religious exercises would be permitted in the schools. If such a situation ever materialized, all semblance of religion would be eliminated from the schools, and they would in fact become secularistic, or in the language of the day, "infidel" institutions. Such an eventuality was anathema to the majority who viewed Bible reading as the distinct Protestant mark on public education. Rather than "infidel"

public schools, it would be better to return to a system of sectarian education as the lesser of two evils. Thus, not only fear of Catholic hostility to the Bible and American institutions but also the dismay that public education would lose its Protestant character caused many Protestants to stand firm in their opposition to Catholic demands. (60) Whereas Kenrick preferred secular public schools to Protestant-oriented ones, Protestants naturally favored Protestant-oriented schools to secular schools. And if Catholics ever should gain control of public education, many Protestants urged the destruction of the public schools and a return to sectarian systems of education. As some school districts gradually began to eliminate Bible reading to lessen Protestant-Catholic tension, Catholics also began to accuse the public schools of being "infidel" institutions and hot-beds of secularism, atheism, and religious indifference. Thus, from two different poles, most Catholics and some Protestants began to attack public education as a peril to the moral and religious development of the children of their respective communions.

But the sides were clearly drawn and there would be no retreat on either side. The Board of Controllers had urged a reasonable compromise but the protagonists simply viewed it as capitulation. And capitulation was not the order of the day. Community hostility, especially on the part of the Protestant majority, was fast welling up and sought a purgative outlet. Indeed, the *Philadelphia Gazette* had prophesied in March that no half measures would "allay the excitement" over the Bible issue. (61) Any emotional incident, however unimportant it was in itself, could ignite the flame and set the cathartic process in motion. Violence would occur and the results could only be ugly. Such an incident occurred in late spring and early summer and transformed the city of brotherly love into a city of brotherly hate. And all this for the honor and glory of God!

V

In April 1844, Kensington, a district adjacent to Philadelphia, was in a state of tension. Many Protestant and Catholic Irish laborers lived here side by side though their old world feuds had not diminished in a new land. Political, economic, and religious differences were further enkindled by the Bible issue and were reaching a breaking point.

Catholics warned nativists that there would be trouble if they tried to hold meetings in Kensington. Armed with clubs, a group of Irish Catholics dispersed such a meeting on May 3. To sustain their rights "against the assaults of Aliens and Foreigners," another meeting was held three days later. Between two and three thousand people gathered to hear several prominent "no popery" speakers. No sooner did the talks begin than did several Catholics run carts of dirt into the crowd and dump them on the ground. Fists began to fly but a sudden rainstorm forced the throng to take cover in a nearby market house. Here disorder continued and scuffles became numerous around the entrance. A large mob quickly gathered around the building as tempers flared and the excitement increased. Suddenly a shot was fired! Then a second shot was heard. In an instant, the meeting ended and a battle ensued between Catholics and Protestants. Outnumbered in men and arms, the nativists retreated and immediately sought more weapons. Soon they returned, strengthened in number and arms, ready to defend their honor, religion, and country. Other Protestants and Catholics heard the shooting and armed themselves to join the fray. The nativists rallied around an American flag and charged the assembling Catholics. After an hour of bitter fighting, they drove the Catholics from the surrounding streets. During this skirmish, George Shiffler, a Protestant boy of about eighteen years old, was killed by a bullet. Immediately, he was portrayed as a "martyr" who shed his blood "defending the American flag." The fighting continued intermittently throughout the night hours and early morning. Nearby Irish Catholic homes were damaged or destroyed, and hundreds of Catholics fled to the woods and fields for safety. When the nativists tried to set fire to a Catholic schoolhouse, shots from neighboring Catholic homes rang out and killed two men and wounded several more. (62)

The lid was off. Philadelphia was now a city of passion and riot. And it was just beginning. The next day, May 7, the city became a besieged fortress. The enemy was all about and deep-seated prejudice and antagonism exploded to the surface. Calm reason and social decency retreated before violence. During the morning, a group of boys and young men paraded through the streets of Kensington and other districts brandishing a torn American flag bearing the inscription: "This is the flag that was trampled under foot by the Irish papists." Sensing a deteriorating situation, Kenrick distributed circulars

throughout the city urging Catholics "to avoid all occasions of excitement, and to shun all public places of assemblage, and to do nothing that in any way may exasperate" the community. But almost as fast as the circulars were posted, they were torn down and shaped into cockade hats by young boys. (63) Nativists were in no mood for peace at this point and many Catholics were disposed the same way. Surrendering its journalistic responsibility to the emotion of the hour, the anti-Catholic *Native American* published its May 7 edition shrouded in black banners usually reserved for the death of a public figure. The editor demanded reprisal and argued that Protestants no longer could hold back from punishing the Irish papists. "Another St. Bartolomew's day is begun on the streets of Philadelphia. The bloody hand of the Pope has stretched itself forth to our destruction. We now call on our fellow-citizens, who regard free institutions, whether they be native or adopted, to arm. Our liberties are now to be fought for; let us not be slack in our preparations." (64) The *North American* also poured coal on the fire: "Blood of citizens, who in peaceful assemblage were assaulted by an organized band of alien or naturalized ruffians, has been shed: unarmed and unprepared were shot down in the streets like dogs, for daring to assemble to consult over the interests of their native land." (65) Extras of the *Native American* and the nativist *Daily Sun*, as well as scores of handbills distributed in the streets, called for a mass meeting that afternoon at Independence Square. This time, warned the literature in deadly earnest, "Let every American come prepared to defend himself." (66)

Independence Square was transformed into an armed camp. Spurred by the various calls, about six thousand men and excitable boys assembled at the Square. Speakers cautioned the assembly to keep the peace but fiery orations belied their counsel. Moreover, the crowd was in a mood for action and little given to listening. Several resolutions were offered that asserted the right of peaceful assemblage, charged Catholics with attempting to drive the Bible from the public schools, and concluded that "the recently successful efforts of the Friends of the Bible in the District of Kensington" were the basic cause for the "murderous scenes" of the day before. These resolutions were unanimously adopted though the motion to adjourn was shouted down. Instead, the crowd decided to march to Kensington. (67) Speech-

making was over and now was the time for action. By five o'clock, the nativists, well organized and marching in regular military array, arrived in Kensington and became locked in conflict with the Catholic inhabitants. Despite the arrival of the military on the scene, some thirty Catholic homes were burned to the ground. As evening progressed, hundreds of Catholic families loaded their possessions on wagons and took to the outlying areas for safety. The local fire companies met with mob interference in their attempts to extinguish the raging fires; and new homes were constantly being put to the torch.

The riots continued into a third day of disorder and destruction. In the early afternoon of May 8, thousands reappeared in the streets of Kensington and demanded vengeance for the slain "martyrs" of the initial "Bloody Tragedy." In a flaming and almost paranoid editorial, the *Daily Sun* contributed to the turmoil by analyzing in vivid language its perception of the situation:

Armed recruits in aid of the Roman Catholics are pouring in from various neighboring towns! We write at this moment with our garments stained and sprinkled with the blood of victims to Native American rights—the rights of conscience—the rights of persons—the holy safeguards and privileges of freedom. Yes, we write with our garments sprinkled with the precious life-drops of martyrs to freedom. Men, murdered with ruthless ferocity, because they dare peacefully to erect that flag, which even foreign Despots have been taught to respect. (68)

Buttressed by such vitriolic editorialism, the crowds became somewhat organized and began a systematic destruction of Catholic homes and set afire whole blocks within a few hours. Kensington was in a state of near insurrection. Large parts of it were in flames. Catholics feared for their lives and even Protestants did not feel secure. Taking a page out of the Old Testament, many Irish and native Protestants either fastened charcoal-written signs bearing the legend "Native American" on the doors of their homes or simply posted a copy of the *Native American* to assure safety for their property and limbs. (69)

Then the mob gathered around St. Michael's Church as rumor spread that arms were stored there. While the military prevented additional homes from being burned, the mob set fire to the church and nearby schoolhouse. Hugh Clark's house was wrecked and his papers scattered to the winds. At about nine in the evening, new

crowds assembled in other locations in Philadelphia. One large group arrived at St. Augustine's Church only to find the mayor, a posse, and the regular police waiting for them. Despite assurances that armed men were not housed in the church, the mob was not satisfied. They scattered the posse and the police with a storm of bricks and stones, charged the church, battered down the doors, and set the edifice aflame. The rectory and seminary adjacent to the church were also put to the torch, and many of the seminary's five thousand library books were used to feed the flames in the buildings as well as a huge bonfire in the street. Still not satisfied, the mob moved to St. Mary's Church ready to repeat its action. However, about a hundred United States marines and sailors from the U.S.S. Princeton were on guard. They charged the crowd with their pikes and cutlasses and quickly dispersed it. Fleeing the area, the mob regrouped and headed for St. John's Cathedral where it met the First City Troop under command of General George Cadwalader. Cadwalader warned the rioters that martial law was in effect and ordered them to disband in five minutes or be fired upon. Under such a threat, the mob slowly left the area though troops guarded the church and every other Catholic church during the remainder of the night and for the next two weeks. Governor David Porter also ordered several thousand additional militia men to Philadelphia to preserve an uneasy peace and to prevent the outbreak of further riots. (70)

Although Irish Catholics had initiated the disorder, they quickly were forced on the defensive and received a great deal of punishment. And whereas the nativists enjoyed strong support from a portion of the Protestant press and many ministers, Catholics never received any encouragement from Kenrick or his clergy. Indeed, threats of physical harm forced some priests to flee the city while others "wore no clerical dress" or "remained in hiding." Kenrick himself spent two nights of the riots with Catholic families and even received an offer of refuge from an Episcopalian clergyman. Some of the clergy went to New York until it was safe to return to Philadelphia. (71) There Hughes was shocked that Philadelphia Catholics did not take a firm stand in defense of their homes and churches. "They should have defended their churches since the authorities could not or would not do it for them. We might forbear from harming the intruder into our house until the last, but his violence to our church

should be promptly and decisively repelled." When Hughes was apprised that nativists might try the same thing in his diocese, he warned local officials that "if a single Catholic Church was burned in New York, the city would become a second Moscow." He counseled Catholics to keep the peace as long as possible but to protect their churches and their property at all cost. (72) But if Hughes was a militant ecclesiastic with the mentality of a fighter, Kenrick's mild temperament militated against such oratory and definitely opposed public agitation and physical violence. When one of his parishioners begged his permission to arm a church and defend it from a mob, Kenrick kindly but firmly refused to grant it. "I have placed my churches under the care of the municipal authorities," was his response. "[I]t is their duty to protect them. Rather let every church burn than shed one drop of blood or imperil one precious soul." (73) Such are the differences in men that often help to shape the course of events.

After three days and nights of rioting and violence, Philadelphia returned to a deceptive calm. More like an armed truce than an honest peace. All the city newspapers expressed shock and denounced mob rule and disorder. The *Native American* thought Protestants were "humbled to the dust" and condemned the "desecration of the Christian altar." Even the *North American* scored those "lawless ruffians" who destroyed homes and invaded churches. The *Democratic Inquirer* perhaps expressed the general sentiments of the community when it admitted that "Philadelphia is indeed in disgrace" and predicted that its citizens would hang their "heads in sorrow and shame" for years to come. (74) Philadelphians were further chastened when Kenrick ordered all Catholic churches closed on the Sunday, May 12, following the riots. No church services would be held since he wished to avoid the possibility of renewed hostility. A group of Quakers asked Kenrick to rescind his order lest Philadelphia be painted not only as a church-burning city but also "as a city in which a man cannot worship God according to his own conscience." Several newspapers pressed Kenrick to reconsider his decision, and General Robert Patterson announced that his forces were sufficient to protect all the churches of the city. Even though the Bishop realized that Patterson's assurance placed him in an awkward position, he refused to change his mind. In his diary, he recorded that a regular schedule of Sunday masses "would have been an occasion of irritating the enemy against

us." Such a precautionary measure must have galled Hughes. But Kenrick could not change what he was; and that was a very different person from the more volatile New Yorker. (75) That Kenrick's move may have been a shrewd maneuver was not missed by nativists. The *Native American* considered the closing of the churches "a stroke of policy on the part of the bishop, to excite sympathy in their [Catholic] behalf," while the *Daily Sun* referred to it as "one of those cunning affectations of persecution." (76) But Kenrick remained firm in his judgment and all Catholic churches remained closed. An editorial in the *Pennsylvanian* recorded a poignant picture of that uneasy Sunday in a garrisoned city:

Sunday in Philadelphia—soldiers marching and counter-marching in the streets, not for display or peaceful purposes, but prepared for actual battle—marines under arms—sailors of the United States Navy, with cutlasses, pistols, boarding pikes, and all the appliances of war, ready for deadly use upon the instant—the echoes awakened by the hoofs of the cavalry, and around the closed churches 'which still remain' are seen waving plumes and flashing bayonets. Such is a Sunday in the nineteenth century in the city of Philadelphia. Religious toleration enforced—by loaded muskets, drawn sabres, and at the cannon's mouth—charity secured through dread of 'grape and cannister.' (77)

Nevertheless, in view of the tumultuous week that had just ended, Sunday came and went with no reported disorders. After all, the sabbath was the day of rest.

Once the riots subsided, at least temporarily, the recriminations began. Several of the secular dailies blamed the riots on gatherings of unthinking persons, scorching rhetoric and press instigation, and the passive support of bystanders. The *Public Ledger* ascribed the riots to "inflammatory appeals made by reckless and unprincipled individuals" and singled out the editor of the *Daily Sun* as a main culprit. The *Pennsylvanian* denounced "men of education and ability who pervert their gifts to mislead and inflame the ignorant" while the *Spirit of the Times* condemned the "unholy alliance" of Protestant clergymen and nativist intriguers. Reproaching native American crimes perpetuated under the guise of religion and liberty, the *Pennsylvania Freeman*, an antislavery paper, concluded that the "incendiarism and human butchering" of the riots showed Protestants to be no "more desirable rulers" than the Pope. Some of the religious press attempted to show a relationship between the riots and the

question of the Bible in the public schools. Among other reasons, the *Christian Observer* attributed the riots to "the efforts of certain party leaders to suppress the reading of the Bible in the public schools" and the spirit of popery which interfered "with the regulations of our schools." The *Christian Repository* thought that the riots, however bloody they may have been, thwarted Catholic "schemes of power" in the schools. Although the *Baptist Record* excoriated the "bloodthirsty murderers" of native Americans, the *New York Baptist Advocate* traced the riots to the "no popery" campaigns of the Protestant churches. The nativist press placed the cause of the riots directly on the attempts of the Catholic clergy to drive the Bible out of the public schools. Since the Bible was the basis for the continuance of American republicanism, the *Daily Sun* argued that Catholics interfered with the Protestant right to the Bible "which the Constitution gives us." (78) Both the nativist press and the American Republican Association glossed over the stigma of church-burning and harped on the fact that Irish Catholics had started the trouble by firing on defenseless Americans exercising their right of assembly. But at the bottom of the conflict were the Catholic attempts to exclude the Bible from the schools. The riots were thus the result of a foreign and despotic priesthood which wanted "to exclude the Bible from our public schools, and doom the children of Republican freemen, to an ignorance of that only true foundation of morals and freedom." Nor did the *Daily Sun* forget the Bible reading issue. "Until it be restored, we are bound to demand it . . . and obtain it we must, and we will!" The *North American* pursued the same theme by blaming the riots on "foreign ecclesiastics, foreign in birth, foreign in education, and foreign in the objects of their mission" who fostered discord with their charge that the Bible was a sectarian book. (79)

Amidst elaborate fanfare, nativists portrayed those "Americans" killed in the riots as "martyrs." Large and emotional funeral processions were held, coffins were draped with American flags, especially the "flag trampled on," and the colors were flown at half-mast by many sympathizers. Concerts were given in memory of the "martyrs" and on behalf of their families, lithographic prints of the "martyrs" were sold, and a ship was built by native-born workers and dedicated to them. Finally, a procession of over five thousand persons escorted the carriages carrying the widows and orphans of the "martyrs"

through the streets of Philadelphia. (80) By no means was this the emotional climate in which to maintain peace.

In the middle of May, a Grand Jury began an investigation of the causes of the riots. In his charge, Judge Anson Parsons reminded the jurors that citizens have a legal right to assemble but that the "assembling itself at an improper time and place, may make all convening, rioters." If the assembled group discussed "subjects injurious to the feelings of others," they may be guilty of fomenting a riot, but those who attack them are [also] guilty of riot." Moreover, if the assembled persons were dispersed by others, the former were rioters if they "rally their friends, convene a superior force, and arm themselves to meet the aggressors again and resist any future attack." (81) On June 15, the Grand Jury issued its presentment. In the main, it accepted the nativist contention that the riots were due "to the efforts of a portion of the community to exclude the Bible from our Public Schools." (82) Many religious journals supported this indictment while Kenrick wrote to his brother in St. Louis that Catholics could never expect justice in a prejudice-ridden community. "I am sure these statements are far from the truth; but conditions are such that Catholic witnesses will hardly be believed, and they are rarely called upon to testify." (83) Rather than attack the Grand Jury findings himself, Kenrick allowed—in fact, probably encouraged—a committee of Catholic laymen to draw up an "Address of the Catholic Laity of Philadelphia to Their Fellow Citizens" that rejected the substance of the presentment. The address reiterated the Catholic position on the school question and quoted previous documents which affirmed that "Catholics have not asked that the Bible be excluded from the Public Schools." The Grand Jury was accused of taking only *ex parte* evidence and of refusing to call upon many eye witnesses of the riots. In the name of the Catholic community, the laymen disclaimed sympathy for those persons who disturbed a public meeting or committed murder. But at the same time, they objected to the Grand Jury's reference to the burning of churches, rectories, and a school as "acts of retaliation." After a reminder that "many of us can say that Philadelphia contains the ashes of our fathers," the address concluded with the plea "that the exclamation, 'I AM AN AMERICAN CITIZEN,' shall continue to be the protection of our rights, and the guarantee of our freedom." (84)

Predictably the nativist press praised the Grand Jury's findings and labeled the Catholic address as a conglomeration of lies and half-truths couched in typical "Jesuitical sophistry." Mass meetings were held to support the Grand Jury and denounce the Catholic response. Nativists in the Southwark district censured its school directors for electing a Catholic to the Board of Controllers and demanded his immediate resignation. Because he was a Catholic, John McCoy was asked to resign his position as a commissioner in Southwark. A meeting of Philadelphia's middle ward denounced the "Address" and "left those defenders of the guilty to their own consciences and to public sentiment." The American Republicans of the "old South Ward" judged the Catholic reply to be "a willful departure from the truth" and expressed their admiration "of the fearless manner in which the Grand Jury met the case." (85)

But native Americans did not feel completely vindicated. Press reports throughout the country held them responsible for the riots. The editor of the *North American* complained that he had read two hundred out-of-town papers that blamed native Americans for instigating the trouble. As a result, "the citizens of Philadelphia are exposed to all sorts of ribaldry" by a "monstrous perversion of facts." (86) But despite the charges and counter-charges, many in the community, both Protestant and Catholic, hoped that things would quiet down and the riots would become part of an unhappy memory. In this spirit, Kenrick urged all Philadelphians to forgive and forget and "in Christian love show the happy influence of Religion, which 'even in the face of an enemy discovers a brother.'" (87) Unfortunately, the Bishop was premature in his call for Christian love and the brotherhood of man.

VI

There were those Philadelphians who realized that the millenium of peace and love had not yet arrived in their city. "The animosities of the contending parties have long been festering, are deeply seated," declared the *North American*. And it predicted that they "are not yet, nor will be healed." (88) Cadwalader also suspected that the May riots had been quelled "only for the moment." However much he desired peace, even Kenrick was "convinced that the enemies of our

faith have not given up the idea of attack and given the occasion they will try to destroy us and our faith." Independence Day was forecast as a likely time for the resumption of trouble. Kenrick was keenly aware of this possibility, and Sheriff Morton McMichael secretly requested all magistrates to have posses ready in their districts for possible disturbances. On July 3, Patterson alerted Cadwalader to have his county division ready "so they can be brought into effective service at the shortest possible notice" and ordered him to keep headquarters notified of his whereabouts. (89) Such apprehensions were based on past experience and on a knowledge of nativist activities in preparation. For weeks American Republicans were organizing a display of strength, including a huge parade and picnic supper for the fourth.

Independence Day dawned fair and cooling breezes promised an even more glorious day. Some seventy thousand spectators were ready for a show. American Republicans wore ribbons identifying their ward associations and displayed such mottoes as "Our Country and Our Bible" and "Our Country and Our Flag." Instead of starting in early afternoon as had been prearranged, the parade was delayed three hours because of some preliminary ceremonies and the logistics of marshalling between five and seven thousand marchers. Thus, one woman presented a banner to the American Republican Association with a speech that reprobated "the dictation of Jesuit Bachelors in the training of our children" and expressed confidence in the Association's efforts "to preserve . . . our rights as a nation to read the Bible and have it read to our children." Many ward and district associations marched in the parade and carried many large and picturesque banners with such inscriptions as: "Our Fathers gave us the Bible—we will not yield it to a Foreign hand," "Foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of a Republican Government," "Right gives Might," "God and our Country," "Search the Scriptures," "May our Land be Immanuel's Land," "The Bible is our Guide," "Liberty and the Bible," "The Light of the World and the Guide of the Nations," "The Bible is the basis of Education and the safeguard of Liberty." Some banners depicted a large Bible with a schoolhouse in the background. Others pictured a child reading the Bible, a figure of Liberty holding an open Bible, a figure of Liberty instructing a child from the Bible, and an American eagle grasping an open Bible in its claws.

Even elaborate floats displayed open Bibles as a symbol of freedom and independence. (90) There was no doubt that native Americans believed in an "open Bible" as the charter for American liberties and national prosperity. And they did not want the community at large to miss this point.

Some twenty thousand people attended the picnic in a pleasant valley just outside of Philadelphia and across the Schuylkill river. While they ate and drank, the crowd listened to patriotic oratory and witnessed a magnificent display of fireworks. People must have enjoyed themselves since the festivities lasted until the early hours of the next day. Rather than return home at all, some people slept in the nearby woods close to the remaining picnic supplies. At some time early in the morning, a small group of ruffians attacked the sleepers and severely beat some of them. Rumor quickly exaggerated the account and transformed it into a murderous affair on the part of Irish Catholics. Four torn American flags added fuel to the charge. McMichael's investigation of the incident exonerated Catholics and accused two rival groups of nativists as the culprits. But the publication of the investigation was belated just long enough for rumor to engender passion. (91)

With memories of the May riots still clear in their minds, Catholics in Southwark, another neighboring district to Philadelphia, anticipated that the "Church-Burners" might use Independence Day as an occasion to renew hostilities. They viewed their church, St. Philip's, as a likely object for arson since it had been attacked in May and because it was located in a Protestant area. When the pastor, the Reverend John P. Dunn, became aware of this possibility, he permitted his brother to store muskets in the church and organize some parishioners for its defense. Unfortunately, some passersby saw some of the guns being taken into the church. Immediately rumor spread that the church was fortified and this made nativists see red. Catholics no doubt had attacked the sleeping picnickers and now they were storing guns in their churches. On the evening of July 5, crowds gathered around several Catholic churches. By far the largest crowd of a thousand persons congregated threateningly outside of St. Philip's. At about ten o'clock, the sheriff and several aldermen entered the church and met the pastor and his brother. Thereupon, an agreement was made to remove the guns from the church. But the

crowd was not satisfied with this accord and screamed for a more intensive search of the church. A second hunt produced more guns, ammunition, and the discovery of several armed men. At this point, Dunn reminded the sheriff that now he had complete responsibility to defend the church. A slight rain began to fall shortly before midnight and the crowd slowly withdrew to their homes. (92)

But the next day was Saturday; the crowd returned in the evening, and trouble flared up anew. When the sheriff could no longer keep control, a troop of militia men arrived hauling a cannon with them. At the sight of the military and the cannon, the mob grew wilder and hurled insults, stones, and assorted brickbats at the militia. When the troop was ordered to fire, the crowd quickly retreated and once again the area was stunned into quiet. Since about twenty of the rioters were arrested and imprisoned in the church, a company of thirty men under Captain John Colahan guarded the church during the rest of the night. One of the prisoners was Charles Naylor, a former congressman from the area, who had dashed in front of the troops and barked at them not to fire on innocent people. Early on Sunday morning, large numbers of people returned to the church and demanded the immediate release of the prisoners. The militia released all the men except Naylor, who was ordered held. Thereupon, the crowd clamored for the freedom of Naylor who suddenly became the new nativist hero. To back their demand, the mob acquired two pieces of cannon and mounted them on a line with the church. Fearful of the consequences, Colahan wisely released Naylor who promptly was hoisted on some men's shoulders and carried to his home amidst cheers and applause. Now the crowd was flushed with victory and insisted upon the withdrawal of Colahan's troop from the church, promising safe conduct for his men and respect for the church. By Sunday afternoon, Lewis Levin, editor of the *Daily Sun*, and Thomas Gover, marshal of the Independence Day parade, announced to a cheering audience that St. Philip's Church was now under the protection of native Americans. Obviously, such protection could not be counted upon with the swell of rioters increasing about the church. Some boys hauled a large log to batter down the western door of the church. Failing in this attempt, they had more success with a newly constructed part of a wall through which they breached a large hole. The mob poured in and for hours walked about the in-

terior of the church. At one point, smoke spouted from the basement, but some men extinguished the flames quickly enough. In the evening, Cadwalader arrived on the scene with troops and regained the church under his jurisdiction. However, the inevitable scuffle occurred. By nine o'clock, shots were being exchanged between soldiers and rioters. Until the early hours of Monday morning, a battle was fought with spikes, files, broken glass, scrap iron, rifles, and even cannon on occasion. The shooting and shouting was heard in the city throughout the night. At daybreak, thousands of armed men gathered at the Wharton Market in Southwark. The military was notified to withdraw from the area or be attacked at four o'clock in the afternoon. After some face-saving procedures were agreed upon, the troops withdrew one hour before the ultimatum. Informed of the seriousness of the situation, Governor Porter arrived in the city in the afternoon and issued a proclamation supporting the efforts of the military and ordered troops from other counties sent to Philadelphia. Eventually five thousand troops were under arms in the city and county. Both the *Native American* and the *Daily Sun* condemned the role of the military in the riots and castigated Porter for his summoning of additional troops into Philadelphia. (93)

With the exception of the *Native American* and *Daily Sun*, the daily press condemned mob violence, supported its military suppression, and called for law and order. "Men must never admit," editorialized the *United States Gazette*, "that the execution of the law may be postponed for the more ready operation of an infuriated mob." A mob was "not to be respected for its numbers" and its outrages were "not to be overlooked and pardoned." Although the arming of St. Philip's Church was considered legal but imprudent, the paper believed that such an incident was not the cause but the pretext for the riots. The *Pennsylvania Freeman* blamed the riots on all citizens who had long sanctioned mob violence in past years. The idea that abolitionists had no right to protection "because their doctrines were unpalatable," reasoned this antislavery journal, "was naturally extended to Catholics, whose doctrines were equally unpalatable to sectarians." Religious nativism was just "another aspect of the same spirit which in the form of prejudice against color has so long been heaping wrongs and insults on our dark-hued brethren." The garrisoning of St. Philip's Church was "the immediate and

exclusive cause" of the riots, declared the *Banner of the Cross*. Such an incident clearly indicated the incompatibility of Catholicism "with our national independence and greatness." The Catholic Church in the United States was a foreign church that would never become reconciled with republicanism. Indeed, most of its hierarchy and clergy were "unnaturalized foreigners, who value not the blessings of American institutions, if they do not even hate the principles of our free constitution." The *Presbyterian* blamed the July riots on the lack of "zeal and energy in ferreting out the assassins who fired on the political and unarmed meeting in Kensington [in May]" and thus encouraged the populace "to cast aside respect for the laws." The *Christian Observer* blamed the riots directly on the arming of St. Philip's Church. Naylor's arrest and imprisonment "in the church, under a guard of Irish Papists" was termed "insufferable insolence." (94) In its response, the *Catholic Herald* ignored the traditional nativist clichés and dealt with the question of the armed church. Everyone knew of impending trouble on Independence Day, argued the paper, and public authorities had "sanctioned measures for a temporary resistance, to keep the assailants in check, until aid could be afforded by the military." The editor reminded his Protestant colleagues that one church handed over to the military and another given to the civil authorities for protection were both burned—"but not until the mob had been assured that there were no persons within to defend them." Catholics naturally feared additional attacks as "threats were publicly made to that effect, and the offensive parade of the 4th of July, wherein the extinction of Roman influence was proclaimed by a Southwark Association, confirmed their fears." (95)

Much of the press condemnation of the military's role in the riots affected the individual soldier and officer. The rioters and their sympathizers especially detested Cadwalader and erected a gallows for his benefit at Wharton Market. Soldiers and officers were the "target for insult and violence" and met with "reproach and contumely." They were threatened anonymously and publicly, hunted through the streets, and driven from their homes. (96) Slowly, however, the tide began to swing toward law and order. On July 10, a group of leading citizens met to express their full support for the conduct of the military and the Governor's efforts to restore peace.

Two thousand of them signed an address that approved the Governor's proclamation, praised the military officers and citizen soldiers for "using lawful force which unlawful force made necessary," and urged their fellow citizens to obey the law with "unquestioning obedience." (97) Gradually, peace and order returned to Philadelphia.

After the July riots, Kenrick made no further complaints against Bible reading in the public schools. He was appalled at the bloodshed and destruction of the last several months, and he did not wish to be a cause for the renewal of further discord in the community. No doubt he also believed that further Catholic agitation would simply be in vain. For the remainder of his stay in Philadelphia, he no longer emphasized dissatisfaction with Bible reading and other devotional exercises in the public schools. Instead, he turned his efforts more to the establishment of parochial schools as the only sure antidote to public education.

But the question of an "open Bible" was not forgotten in Philadelphia. The publication of Pope Gregory XVI's letter on Bible societies in mid July 1844 did not help the matter. This was a letter to Italian bishops advising them to warn Catholics against the use of unauthorized Biblical translations being freely distributed by Protestant societies in Italy. The Pope renewed the Catholic prohibition of those Bibles "in the vulgar tongue" that had not been approved by the Church and were without explanatory notes. (98) The nativist press had a field day with this document. The *Daily Sun* hoped that its readers were now convinced that Catholics wanted "to expel the Bible from our Public Schools." Reminding its readers of Kenrick's previous statements and the sentiments found in the address of the Catholic laity, the *North American* insisted that Catholics "must retract their republican professions, or they must denounce the Pope for this bold attack upon the truth [that is, the Bible] by which republicanism exists." The *Christian Advocate and Journal*, a New York Methodist paper, thought it "mean and contemptible" for Catholics so to equivocate "in this matter of the Bible." An article in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for July 1844 warned Protestants that if they were not willing "to be taxed for having the *mass*, *purgatory*, and the *Romish faith* introduced into the New Testament, and taught in the public schools," they must be on their guard constantly and speak out frequently. In a circular letter

published in 1844, the Philadelphia Baptist Association reminded its readers of the necessity of public school Bible reading and Catholic opposition to this practice. "It is, therefore, the duty of every parent to place his children only where they may be educated in an acquaintance with the Bible, and as citizens, who are interested for our children's sake, in the Common Schools of our land, we should resist, with the utmost energy, and to the last extremity, every attempt of the man of sin and his emissaries, to rob our schools of the Bible, and our children of its precious truths." Subsequent meetings of native Americans pursued this theme and reminded their fellow citizens of their duty to give "full recognition of the Bible" in systems of public education. Typically, such gatherings promised to continue their defense of the Bible "against all foreign aggression, as necessary to freedom of conscience, and the equal rights of man." The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, meeting in Philadelphia in 1846, declared that a major part of its work was to "keep the Bible open" and to battle "Universalism (atheism), Unitarianism (a dead religion), and Fourierism (free thinking), and Romanism, most subtle and dangerous of all." (99) As a result of such resolutions, the Bible issue remained a major bone of contention between Protestants and Catholics in Philadelphia as well as in the rest of the country. This was true in the 1840's and continued through the rest of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century.

VII

Many American Protestants of this period feared the growing influence of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. Samuel Morse, William Brownlee, Walter Colton, and countless others warned repeatedly of a papist alliance with European Catholic monarchies to conquer the country and subjugate it to monarchical and ecclesiastical rule. In his *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States*, Morse insisted "that there is good reason for believing that the despots of Europe are attempting by the spread of Popery in this country, to subvert its free institutions. . . ." (100) Such apprehensions were very real to thousands of Protestants and especially to militant nativists. As increasing numbers of Catholic immigrants settled in America, the possibility of an eventual takeover began to

look more and more plausible to Protestants. Whole sections of major cities were becoming overwhelmingly Catholic, churches appeared to be springing up everywhere, and bishops and priests were beginning to enter into public debate with Protestant ministers over their respective creeds. This numerical increase helped to develop, for good or ill, a more confident and militant Catholicism which brought it headlong into conflict with a suspicious and ever vigilant Protestantism. Catholic churchmen began to demand those rights that they believed were inalienable and to use every legitimate means to obtain them for their predominantly immigrant flocks. Very often, however, this new breed of immigrant clergymen failed to understand the psychological dimensions of a deeply entrenched Protestant culture. From the time of the Jamestown settlement and the Mayflower Compact, Catholicism had been a persecuted sect and at best a suffered and impotent minority. Abhorrence and distrust of Romanism had come to the new world from old world conflict and had developed into an essential part of the colonial mind and later national temper. Sin, satan, and Popery were an unholy trinity to be shunned and cast into the everlasting abyss. "Hatred and fear of 'Popery' or 'Romanism' were imbibed with the milk a God-fearing Protestant child drew from its mother's breast." (101) Moreover, within the historical context of religious liabilities in Ireland, these Catholic ecclesiastics almost expected a certain amount of Protestant harassment to hamper their work. But one thing was certain in a non-ecumenical age. Protestants were the religious enemy, and they who possessed the "truth" were not about to capitulate to heresy. "The oldest institution in Western civilization," Marcus Hansen has remarked, "was not going to revise its program because a few Yankees looked upon it with disfavor." (102)

No area of disagreement between Protestants and Catholics caused more friction than that of education and Bible reading in the public schools. When Catholics objected to their children reading an unauthorized version of the Bible in the public schools, Protestants denounced them as opposing the word of God. Since Catholicism was branded as a prostituted religion not sanctioned by the Bible, it was accused of deliberately suppressing the Scriptures lest its members discover the truth and light of reformed Christianity. In addition, most Protestants saw a real relationship between Bible reading, the

preservation of the American republic, and continued national prosperity. "Schools without Bible reading would rear a nation of Godless voters," which would be an affront to God and a danger to the country. Such an eventuality was simply unthinkable to the Protestant mind. Therefore, many Protestants concluded that Catholic attempts to exclude the Bible from the common schools (as well as appeals for public funds for parochial schools) were part of a master plan to win Protestant America for the Scarlet Lady of Rome. Large numbers of usually tolerant Americans were thus aroused and felt compelled "to take an active interest in organized anti-Catholicism." (103)

The Philadelphia school dispute and subsequent riots document this contention. Deep commitment and strong prejudice degenerated Protestant-Catholic differences into social disorder and blood-drenched violence. Who was right? Who was wrong? These are not easy questions to answer since each side argued from different premises and engaged in ambivalence. But neither Protestants nor Catholics argued that secular and religious instruction could be separated without undue harm to the total development of the child. How to achieve the best possible total development was the point at issue. Here Protestants and Catholics disagreed sharply and joined in a battle that unfortunately left little or no room for compromise.

Protestants never hesitated to state their position in clear and cogent language. America was a Protestant country; Protestantism was essential for its continued welfare; therefore, the public institutions of the country should reflect this religious heritage in word and deed. Since the public schools prepared children for their moral, social, and civic responsibilities, they were in a unique position to explain and inculcate those religious and political principles that gave birth and continued sustenance to this Christian, that is, Protestant, nation. Not that the schools should include sectarian creeds or doctrines in their instruction. But the Bible, a religious and patriotic symbol of the highest order, included those moral and spiritual lessons that were necessary to function well in a Protestant and republican country. Since all true Christians believed in the Bible in one way or another, it was important that the future citizens of this country come to understand and respect its message. The Bible was the word of God and needed no annotated additions to explain its mean-

ing. The common version used in the schools was the traditional King James Bible. This version was not sectarian since it contained the essence of the Christian faith. Catholics opposed it because they never really believed in the Bible at all. It was not so much that they objected to the Protestant Bible in the public schools as much as that they wanted all Bible reading removed from the schools. And because the Bible was the symbol of Protestant identification with Americanism, Catholic complaints amounted to an un-American stance perpetuated by immigrant hordes who were subjects of a foreign ecclesiastical power. Therefore, Catholics were guilty of a kind of treason since Bible reading was viewed not only as a religious act but also as a patriotic duty. Some Protestants occasionally argued that the presence of two Biblical versions in the public schools would create such confusion and disorder that it would result in the practical exclusion of all Bible reading and transform the schools into "infidel" or secularistic institutions. Regardless of the reasoning, however, the Protestant-American formula was the basic principle that most Protestants and all nativists invoked during the Bible controversy in Philadelphia.

Throughout the controversy, Kenrick trod a careful and at times ambivalent position. He urged a nonreligious education in the public schools, that is, an education without any religious teaching or exercises, but he did not believe in such an education. But for Kenrick a nonreligious education was preferable to a Protestant-oriented education. It was not a greater good to be obtained but rather a greater evil to be avoided. His policy was one of expediency in adjusting to an existing educational situation. Since he could not provide a Catholic education for all the children in his diocese and since he feared Protestant proselytism in the public schools, he opted for an education separated from religion. To this end, he argued that "children are not sent there [the public school] to learn religion, nor to practice it." In an article on the controversial Girard College, Kenrick complained that the "unchristian education" intended by its founder had been compromised by the introduction of the Protestant Bible. "The directors of the College have adopted the Protestant version of the Bible, and have thus virtually made it a Protestant institution." (104) As a result, he discouraged Catholic parents from sending their children to the college. In like manner, he criticized the

forced attendance of Catholic naval personnel at Protestant church services under pain of lash and court martial. "We are decidedly of the opinion," wrote the Bishop in the *Catholic Herald*, "that there ought to be no chaplains. . . . Order and discipline must be maintained *without religion*, where there is no common faith." (105) Kenrick understood the limitations involved in the public expression of religious faith in a pluralistic society.

In the heat of battle, Kenrick changed his position or at least his emphasis. On different occasions, Kenrick urged the separation of religion from public education, asked that Catholic children be excused from reading the King James Bible, and favored the exclusion of all religious practices and exercises unless the Douay version be permitted in the public schools. Under the pseudonym "Sentinel," he sanctioned the separation of religion and public education and argued that the schools were open to all including "the children of unbelievers." On the basis of this premise, no Bible—regardless of the version—should have been permitted in the schools. But Kenrick insisted repeatedly that he never asked to have the King James Bible removed from the schools. Yet he also maintained that Catholic children were not sent to public schools to receive a religious education. As an astute logician, Kenrick may have kept the distinctions clear in his mind. They certainly were not always clear to his adversaries and to the community at large. Undoubtedly, Kenrick shifted his position to meet the practical exigencies of the emerging controversy. In fact, his policy seems to have been one of response to a given situation at a given time. In this manner of operation, Kenrick acted no differently than Hughes and other bishops who were locked in similar school battles with an entrenched Protestant majority.

Kenrick may have opted for a nonreligious education in a specific existential situation but he never believed in it as the ideal. What often is, is quite different from what ought to be. Kenrick hoped to make the public schools religiously neutral so that Catholic children could attend them without any danger to their religious faith. The secular instruction of the schools would be supplemented by catechetical lessons given in the parish churches. The ideal, of course, was to build sufficient Catholic schools to accommodate all the children of the diocese. In 1850, Kenrick wrote that he was "fully sen-

sible of the importance of Catholic schools, but I do not know how we are to establish them. Teachers of a religious character are not easily had, and schoolhouses are wanting." (106) Catholics had neither the financial resources to build such schools nor the personnel to staff them. He would have welcomed the use of public funds for the establishment and maintenance of Catholic schools. On several occasions, he argued the justice of distributing "public funds to each Religious Society, in proportion to number of children educated." But he knew that such an option would never be countenanced in the Philadelphia of his time. As a result, he argued for a secular alternative for the public schools in a religiously pluralistic society: "the entire separation of Religion from public education, as the only just system for schools in which the children of all denominations mingle together." (107) Perhaps if clergymen from different denominations lobbied for public funds, such aid would be forthcoming. At least Kenrick thought this a distinct possibility. But Protestant clergymen generally did not "speak loudly" on this subject, and Kenrick never pushed his plan very hard. Hughes had just been defeated in a bitter fight for public funds; and Kenrick thought the New York Bishop had been "fairly worsted" in the contest. Besides, he had more than he could do in trying to make the public schools religiously acceptable for Catholic children. As a result, Kenrick never made any attempt to obtain public funds while he remained Bishop of Philadelphia.

When Archbishop Eccleston died in 1851, Rome chose Kenrick to succeed him in Baltimore. Because Kenrick now shepherded the oldest and most prestigious diocese in the United States, Rome gave the new Archbishop the authority to preside over the First Plenary Council of Baltimore which met in 1852. (108) Six archbishops and twenty-five bishops met for ten days to discuss national church problems. Education received a great deal of attention. Probably written for consideration at the Council, Kenrick prepared an essay entitled "Religion the Basis of All Sound Education." A statement about the nature of education, it did not mirror the practical accommodations of his days in Philadelphia. For the separation of religion from education tended to "indifference and infidelity" and would lead to "a generation of unbelievers." Even on the practical level, he concluded that public education would never become acceptable for Catholic children and was detrimental to their religious development.

"For Catholics it is always objectionable and dangerous, so that if at any time they [parents] be constrained by law to send their children to the public schools or yield to the pressure of public prejudice, they must take the necessary precautions and provide for their religious education." (109) The Council, in its decrees, officially exhorted bishops "to see that schools are established in connection with the churches of their dioceses." The pastoral letter, written by Kenrick's brother, the Archbishop of St. Louis, urged Catholic parents to provide for their children "an education based on religious principles, accompanied by religious practices and always subordinate to religious influence." Both clergy and laity were instructed not to listen "to those who would persuade you that religion can be separated from secular instruction." (110) Certainly from this time on, Kenrick devoted much of his time to establishing more and better Catholic schools in his archdiocese.

Catholics generally were unsuccessful in their attempts to have their children excused from reading the Protestant Bible or to have the Douay version used as an acceptable alternative. They were thought to be against the Bible, and they met opposition at every step of the way. Kenrick had little success in Philadelphia, and Hughes had met defeat earlier in New York. Kenrick, Hughes, and other bishops attempted, in the 1840's, to establish a *modus vivendi* with the public schools. In the 1850's, it seems, they in effect gave up the fight. The battle appeared hopeless, and many bishops abandoned public education and made strenuous efforts toward establishing separate and privately financed diocesan parochial school systems. Determined but unsuccessful attempts to obtain public funds met defeat in the early 1850's. (111) By this time, Hughes was decreeing that schools should be built before churches and a fateful motto was being impressed upon the American Catholic mind: every Catholic child in a Catholic school. Although impractical from the start, this was the ideal that influenced much Catholic educational thought during the rest of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century.

The Philadelphia riots convinced Kenrick that the public schools would not meet the educational needs of Catholic children. Many Protestants never understood the basis of Catholic objections and remained adamant in their insistence that Bible reading and other

devotional exercises continue in the public schools. But whether Protestant or Catholic, both sides believed that they were doing the will of God and at the same time furthering the cause of American republicanism. And, after all, who can oppose those doing God's will without opposing God Himself! From this perspective, Protestant-Catholic tensions were inevitable. Indeed, the surprising fact is that there were so few Philadelphia riots in pre-Civil War America.

Notes

1. A coadjutor is usually an assistant bishop with the right of succession to the bishopric. (Conwell died in 1842.) Frequently, as with Kenrick, a coadjutor bishop has all the power of administration of the diocese. For a description of the chaotic condition of the diocese of Philadelphia, see John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in The United States* (New York: John G. Shea, 1892), III. A difficult question at best, trusteeism was a contest between the clergy and the laity concerning control of the temporalities of parishes as well as the right to appoint pastors to these parishes. Although this problem plagued many Catholic dioceses in the United States, it was especially severe in Philadelphia and hotly contested for over a decade. A large number of pamphlets on the Philadelphia trustee problem may be found at the Catholic Historical Society in Philadelphia. Cf. Francis E. Tourscher, *The Hogan Schism and Trustee Troubles in St. Mary's Church* (Philadelphia, 1930); Francis Kenrick to Peter Kenrick, Philadelphia, April 11, 1844, in Francis E. Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence* (Lancaster, Pa.: Wickersham Printing Co., 1920), p. 187.
2. For a more complete study of Kenrick's early years and his stay in Philadelphia, see Hugh J. Nolan, *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia (1830-1851)* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1948).
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 147-48, 153, 242-44, 247, 257, 277.
4. John R. G. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D. D. First Archbishop of New York* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1866), p. 519.
5. *Constitutiones Diocesanae in Synodis Philadelphiensibus, Annis 1832, 1842, 1847, 1853, et 1857, Latae et promulgatae* (Philadelphia: Ex Typis Fratrum McLaughlin, 1873), p. 8: "Ne temere incepta haud feliciter succedant, nullum Orphanotrophium, vel Scholam sub cura Sororum Charitatis, vel virginum Deo dicatarum in Dioecesi institutendam in posterum volumus, nisi praevia nostra licentia in scriptis..."

6. Francis Kenrick to Paul Cullen, Philadelphia, March 28, 1843, Irish College Correspondence (in the American Catholic Historical Society St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.). This collection includes the correspondence of various clergymen, mostly bishops, with individuals at the Irish College in Rome. Although the originals are at the Irish College, handwritten copies were made by F. Kittle and later printed in the *American Catholic Historical Society Records* (1896-1898). Practically all the correspondence was with the Reverend Paul Cullen. He served as President of the Irish College, Archbishop of Armagh and of Dublin, and became a Cardinal of the Irish Church in 1866.
7. Edward Barron to Paul Cullen, Philadelphia, October 7, 1838, *ibid.*
8. Ben. Pearley Poore, *The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1877), II, 1547, 1553; James Pyle Wickersham, *A History of Education in Pennsylvania* (Lancaster, Pa.: Inquirer Publishing Co., 1886); Pamphlet *Laws of Pennsylvania, 1817-1818*, p. 124, in *A Digest of the Acts of Assembly Relative to the First School District* (Philadelphia, n.d.), pp. 11-20; "Governor's Annual Message," in *Hazard's Register*, XVI (December 12, 1835), 372; *The Famous Speech of Hon. Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania in Opposition to the Repeal of the Common School Law of 1834, in the House of Representatives, April 11, 1835* (Philadelphia: T. Stevens Memorial Association of Philadelphia, 1904); H. E. Scudder, *Recollections of Samuel Breck with Passages from His Notebooks (1778-1862)* (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1877), pp. 17, 64-65, 77-78; Pamphlet *Laws of Pennsylvania, 1833-1834*, p. 170, in *A Digest of the Acts of Assembly Relative to the First School District* (Philadelphia, n.d.), pp. 30-33; Thomas H. Burrowes, *Annual Report of the Common Schools, Academies and Colleges of Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg: Samuel D. Patterson, 1837); Robert Landis Mohr, *Thomas Henry Burrowes, 1805-1871* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946).
9. *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of the Controllors of the Public Schools* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1844), pp. 5-6. Philadelphia City and County was School District No. One and under a Board of Controllors. The district was divided into eleven sections, and each section was under a separate Board of Directors. The number of directors in each section was set by the School Law of 1818. Directors were appointed by the city councils or commissioners in incorporated areas but elected by the people in the townships. The Board of Controllors, twenty-one in number, was chosen by and from the directors. Each sectional Board of Directors could choose one sixth of its membership to serve on the Board of Controllors. The Board of Controllors de-

- terminated the amount of tax money needed each year, bought property, erected schools, furnished schools, determined the number of teachers to be employed in each school, set the salaries of teachers, and prescribed and furnished all textbooks. Cf. *Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Controllers of Public Schools* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1842), pp. 4-5.
10. *Catholic Herald*, January 30, 1834. Perhaps a reason for this confidence in the schools may be found in the active promotion of Catholics in the founding of the state system of public schools. These Catholics included Matthew Carey, Robert Walsh, John Keating, Judge Archibald Randall, Lewis Ryan, and the Reverend Patrick Hurley. These men at one time or another served as controllers or directors of public schools in Philadelphia.
 11. *Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Controllers of Public Schools* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1842), p. 5. It should be noted, however, that as the dispute over public school Bible reading deepened, Kenrick paid relatively little attention to this distinction.
 12. *Catholic Herald*, April 5, 12, 1838.
 13. *Catholic Herald*, April 5, 1838.
 14. *Catholic Herald*, March 21, 1839. In addition, "Sentinel" also urged the Legislature to investigate "the books used in the public schools, and the exercises by which religious feelings are fostered in the pupils. To the report might be added a list of the teachers and their respective religious professions, and also the number of pupils in each school, and the religious profession of their parents. The reading of the Bible according to the version published by order of His Majesty King James I, and singing of hymns, an occasional explanation of Scripture by a zealous teacher, male or female, will be found to be among the daily exercises, which, with a sacred caution not to let a Catholic into the chair of instruction, wherever it can be avoided, afford no doubtful evidences of the genius of sectarianism which presides over our public education. . . ."
 15. *Public Ledger*, April 18, 1839; *Banner of the Cross*, November 30, 1839. Cf. *Catholic Herald*, May 2, October 24, 31, November 14, 1839.
 16. For a detailed investigation of the school dispute in New York City, see Vincent P. Lannie, *Public Money and Parochial Education: Bishop Hughes, Governor Seward, and the New York School Controversy* (Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1968). As expected, most of the Protestant press in Philadelphia denounced Hughes's efforts in New York. Cf. *Protestant Banner*, April 22, 1842; *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), November 3, December 1, 1843; *Presbyterian*, February 27, 1841, January 14, 21, 1843, March 23, 1844. Cf. *Pennsylvania*, April 18, 1842; *Philadelphia*

- Ledger*, June 10, 1844; *North American*, January 14, 1843, March 14, May 18, 1844. For a defense of Hughes' position, see the *Catholic Herald*, March 4, 1841.
17. *Catholic Herald*, June 24, November 25, 1841.
 18. *North American*, December 11, 1841.
 19. *Presbyterian*, January 1, 1842. Cf. *Lutheran Observer* (Baltimore), November 26, 1841.
 20. *Catholic Herald*, December 16, 1841.
 21. *Catholic Herald*, January 6, 1842. "Liber" had offered this proposal even before January. Cf. *Catholic Herald*, December 16, 1841.
 22. *Catholic Herald*, December 30, 1841.
 23. *New York Observer*, October 30, November 6, 1841. Cf. *Christian Advocate and Journal* (New York), November 10, 1841; *New York Evangelist*, November 6, 1841; *The Churchman* (New York), November 12, 1841; *New York Commercial Advertiser*, October 30, November 1, 1841; *New York Tribune*, October 30, November 2, 1841; *New York Sun*, November 1, 2, 1841; *New York Herald*, November 1, 2, 3, 1841.
 24. *Catholic Herald*, January 6, 1842.
 25. *Ibid.*
 26. *Banner of the Cross*, quoted in the *Catholic Herald*, January 20, 1842.
 27. *Catholic Herald*, January 20, 1842.
 28. *Catholic Herald*, December 16, 1841, April 14, 28, May 12, 1842.
 29. *Catholic Herald*, May 5, 19, July 7, 1842.
 30. Francis Kenrick, *Letter Ledger*, pp. 202-4, Philadelphia Archdiocesan Archives. This *Ledger* is a kind of diary of 267 pages and embraces the entire period of Kenrick's episcopacy in Philadelphia. It was written in four languages—though principally Latin—and contains a record of letters written and received as well as copies of the more important correspondence. Copies of this letter appeared in the following papers: *Protestant Banner*, January 19, 1843; *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), January 27, 1843; *North American*, January 14, 1843; *United States Gazette*, January 14, 1843; *New York Freeman's Journal*, January 21, 1843.
 31. *United States Gazette*, January 14, 1843.
 32. *Catholic Herald*, January 19, 1843. In early 1843, Kenrick assumed the editorial duties of the newspaper because "the printer burdened with debt, could no longer pay the editor." Francis Kenrick to Peter Kenrick, Philadelphia, February 6, 1843, in Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, pp. 160-63. In March 1845, the Reverend D. Forrestal became the new editor. It is interesting to note that while Kenrick served as editor, "Sentinel" wrote no letters to the *Herald*.
 33. *North American*, January 14, 1843.
 34. *Presbyterian*, January 21, 1843.

35. *Ibid.*
36. *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), January 27, 1843.
37. *Baptist Record*, March 1, 8, 1843.
38. *Episcopal Recorder*, April 8, 1843. "If our common schools and other educational interests be penetrated with the influence of the Gospel," declared Cheever, "we are saved."
39. *Catholic Herald*, January 19, 1843.
40. *Literary Age*, quoted in *Catholic Herald*, February 16, 1843.
41. *Address of the Board of Managers of the American Protestant Association; with the Constitution and Organization of the Association* (Philadelphia: James C. Haswell, 1843), pp. 5, 7-9, 18-19, 42. This was printed in many newspapers. Eventually, a hundred thousand copies of the address were printed and circulated throughout the country. Cf. An American Citizen, *The Pope and the Presbyterians. A Review of the Warning of Jefferson* (Philadelphia: James M. Campbell, 1845), p. 46.
42. *Banner of the Cross*, January 21, 1843; *Catholic Herald*, February 23, 1843. Cf. *Presbyterian*, January 14, 1843; *The Churchman* (New York), quoted in the *Catholic Herald*, January 26, 1843; *New York Freeman's Journal*, January 28, 1843; *Lutheran Observer* (Baltimore), January 27, July 7, 1843.

In 1843, the Pennsylvania Society for Evangelizing the Jews was founded by many of the same clergymen who were members of the American Protestant Association. Isaac Leeser, editor of the *Occident and American Jewish Advocate*, warned that this Society would be watched, and its proceedings exposed "to the scorn of an enlightened Christian public through the daily press." By December 1843, Leeser was advocating Jewish elementary day schools, since there were some public school teachers who took "special pains to warp the mind and to implant the peculiar tenets of Christianity clandestinely. . . ." His specific complaints against public education included the recitation of prayers "in which the name of a mediator is invoked" and the study of the New Testament "as an authority equal if not superior to the received word of God." Jews thus found themselves in much the same situation as were Catholics. Cf. Isaac Leeser, "Pennsylvania Society for Evangelizing the Jews," *The Occident and American Jewish Advocate*, I (October 1843), 351-52; Isaac Leeser, "Jewish Children Under Gentile Teachers," *The Occident and American Jewish Advocate*, (December 1843), 411.

43. John Hancock Lee, *The Origin and Progress of the American Party in Politics: Embracing a Complete History of the Philadelphia Riots in May and July, 1844, etc.* (Philadelphia: Elliott & Cihon, 1855), pp. 15-18, 22, 40; John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New York:

- D. Appleton and Co., 1910), VII, pp. 374-75. One of the posters that was circulated in the city may be examined at the Library Company of Philadelphia, UY6-50431, O. 18.
44. Colton's sixteen-page pamphlet was reprinted in *The Quarterly Review of the American Protestant Association*, I (January 1844), 10-22. Cf. *Philadelphia Gazette*, December 23, 1843, January 5, 1844; John J. O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks* (Philadelphia: John J. McVey, 1904), p. 124; Walter Colton, *The Sea and the Sailor (With a Memoir by Rev. Henry C. Cheever)* (New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1851), pp. 380-84.
 45. *Catholic Herald*, February 15, 1844.
 46. *Catholic Herald*, March 7, 1844. Cf. *Pennsylvanian*, February 29, 1844.
 47. *Public Ledger*, February 28, 29, March 1, 1844; *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), March 15, 1844; *New York Freeman's Journal*, March 23, 1844; *Protestant Banner*, March 7, 1844; *Pennsylvanian*, April 16, 1842; *Episcopal Recorder*, March 9, 1844.
 48. A Protestant and Native Philadelphian, *The Truth Unveiled: or A Calm and Impartial Exposition of the Origin and Immediate Cause of the Terrible Riots and Rebellion in Philadelphia, in May and July, A.D. 1844* (Baltimore: Metropolitan Tract Society, 1844), pp. 30-31.
 49. *Presbyterian*, March 16, 1844.
 50. *Presbyterian*, March 9, 16, 1844.
 51. *Episcopal Recorder*, March 9, 1844.
 52. *Catholic Herald*, March 14, 21, 1844. Cf. *Public Ledger*, March 12, 13, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 9, 11, 12, 1844; *North American*, March 12, 1844.
 53. *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 12, 1844.
 54. *Catholic Herald*, March 14, 1844.
 55. *Catholic Herald*, March 21, 1844.
 56. *Ibid.* Cf. Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, pp. 94, 139, 150, 224, 297, 361.
 57. *North American*, March 14, 15, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 14, 15, 1844. The mass gathering was preceded the evening before by a meeting of "native Americans." This meeting passed several resolutions and organized the turnout for the following day.
 58. *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Controllers of the Public Schools* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1844), p. 7.
 59. *Presbyterian*, March 23, 1844.
 60. *Presbyterian*, March 9, 16, 1844.
 61. *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 12, 1844.
 62. *Native American*, April 26, May 2, 3, 4, 6, June 3, 1844; Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-61; Francis X. McGowan, *Historical Sketch of St. Augustine's Church* (Philadelphia: D. F. Gallagher & Co., 1896), p. 73. Whether

a nativist or an Irish Catholic fired the first shot has never been settled definitely. Newspaper and pamphlet reports of trial jury witnesses indicate conflicting testimony. All that remains are the official notebook listing of the May Sessions of the Grand Jury indictments of 1844 at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and the official listing of cases and trial jury verdicts at the City Archives of Philadelphia. In all probability, the culprit will never be identified nor is it of importance in the unfolding of the subsequent riots. The point is that a shot was fired. Cf. *Protestant Banner*, June 20, 1844; *Spirit of the Times*, May 7, September 18, 1844; *Public Ledger*, May 9, June 6, 1844; *Catholic Herald*, September 19, 26, 1844.

63. *Philadelphia Gazette*, May 8, 1844; *Native American*, May 7, June 6, 1844; *Catholic Herald*, May 9, September 26, 1844; Sister Mary St. Henry, *Nativism in Pennsylvania with Particular Regard to Its Effect on Politics and Education, 1840-1860* (Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1936), p. 19.
64. *Native American*, May 7, 1844.
65. *North American*, May 7, 1844.
66. According to court testimony, this call for arms was added to the announcement of the meeting by the Reverend John Gihon. Cf. *Catholic Herald*, September 26, 1844.
67. *Philadelphia Gazette*, May 8, 1844; *Native American*, June 7, 1844.
68. *Pennsylvanian*, May 8, 1844; *Native American*, May 8, 1844; *Catholic Herald*, September 19, 26, 1844; J. P. Thompson, "The Philadelphia Riots," *New Englander*, II (July 1844), 478; *Daily Sun*, May 8, 1844.
69. *Native American*, May 9, 1844.
70. Thomas C. Middleton, "The Reverend T. J. Donaghue," *American Catholic Historical Society Records*, XXIII (June 1912), 76-77; McGowan, *op. cit.*, pp. 76, 78; Catholic Eyewitness, "The Anti-Catholic Riots of 1844 in Philadelphia," *American Catholic Historical Researches*, XIII (April 1896), p. 53; *History of the First City Troop, 1774-1874* (Philadelphia: Hollowell & Co., 1875), p. 55; "The Philadelphia Anti-Catholic Riots," *United States Catholic Magazine*, VIII (June 1844), 382-84; *Catholic Herald*, May 16, 23, 1844; *Saturday Courier*, May 10, 1844; *Germantown Telegraph*, May 15, 1844.
71. *New York Freeman's Journal*, May 11, 1844; *Spirit of the Times*, May 13, 1844; *Native American*, June 26, 1844; Francis E. Tourscher, *Diary and Visitation Record of the Rt. Rev. Francis Kenrick, 1830-1851* (Lancaster, Pa.: Wickersham Printing Co., 1916), p. 223; Charles Rockland Tyng, *The Record and Work of the Rev. Stephen Higginson Tyng, D.D., and History of St. George Church, New York to the Close of His Rectorship* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1890), p. 144; *Catholic Standard*, September 19, 1885.
72. Hassard, *op. cit.*, pp. 276-78; *New York Freeman's Journal*, May 11, 18, 1844. Cf. *Daily Sun*, May 11, 1844.

73. Letter of William Keating, quoted in the *Catholic Standard*, September 21, 1885; Francis Kenrick to Peter Kenrick, Philadelphia, June 17, 1844, in Tourscher, *Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, pp. 193-94.
74. *Native American*, May 9, 1844; *North American*, May 9, 1844; *Inquirer*, May 10, 1844. Cf. Diaries of Sidney George Fisher (in the Sidney George Fisher Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia), VIII, May 1844.
75. *Catholic Herald*, May 16, 1844; *United States Gazette*, May 10, 11, 13, 1844; *Pennsylvanian*, May 10, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, May 11, 1844; *Public Ledger*, May 13, 1844; Michael O'Connor, *Archbishop Kenrick and His Work* (Philadelphia, 1868), p. 24; Francis Kenrick to Peter Kenrick, Philadelphia, May 27, 1844, in Tourscher, *Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, pp. 188-93. Despite Kenrick's prohibition, several masses were said on Sunday. Cf. Tourscher, *Visitation Diary*, pp. 223-24, n. 464; *Pennsylvanian*, May 13, 1844.
76. *Native American*, June 8, 1844; *Daily Sun*, May 13, 1844.
77. *Pennsylvanian*, May 13, 1844.
78. *Public Ledger*, May 10, 13, 1844; *Pennsylvanian*, May 10, 1844; *Spirit of the Times*, May 9, 16, 1844; *Pennsylvania Freeman*, May 9, 1844; *Christian Observer*, May 10, 17, 1844; *Christian Repository*, quoted in *Catholic Herald*, May 23, 1844; *Baptist Record*, quoted in *Catholic Herald*, June 6, 1844; *Baptist Advocate*, quoted in *Catholic Herald*, May 23, 1844; *Daily Sun*, May 11, 14, 16, 1844.
79. *Daily Sun*, May 11, 14, 16, 1844; *North American*, May 21, 1844.
80. *Native American*, May 28, July 3, 6, August 8, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, May 9, 1844; *Saturday Courier*, June 1, 1844; Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 132; *A Full and Complete Account of the Late Awful Riots in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: John B. Perry, 1844), p. 37; Joseph L. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: John J. McVey, 1909), p. 331.
81. *Catholic Herald*, May 23, 30, June 6, 13, 1844; *United States Gazette*, May 16, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, May 16, 1844.
82. *Catholic Herald*, June 20, 1844; *United States Gazette*, June 17, 1844; *Native American*, June 17, 1844.
83. Francis Kenrick to Peter Kenrick, Philadelphia, June 17, 1844, in Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, pp. 193-94.
84. *Address of the Catholic Laity of Philadelphia to Their Fellow Citizens* (Philadelphia: M. Fithian, 1844). This lengthy address was printed in full in the *Catholic Herald*, June 27, 1844.
85. *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), June 24, 28, 1844; *Presbyterian*, June 22, 1844; *North American*, June 17, 1844; *Public Ledger*, June 26, 1844; *Native American*, July 2, 3, 1844.
86. *North American*, June 17, 1844; *Native American*, June 26, July 3, 1844.
87. *Catholic Herald*, May 16, 1844.

88. *North American*, May 13, 1844.
89. Francis Kenrick to Peter Kenrick, Philadelphia, June 11, 1844, Kenrick Papers (in the Archdiocesan Archives of Baltimore), 30 C 37; Joseph R. Ingersoll to George Cadwalader, Washington, May 20, 1844, George Cadwalader to Joseph R. Ingersoll, Philadelphia, May 24, 1844, Robert Patterson to George Cadwalader, July 3, 1844, Cadwalader Papers (in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia); Circular letter from the Sheriff's Office, June 28, 1844, Morton McMichael Papers (in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.).
90. *Philadelphia Gazette*, July 6, 1844; *Pennsylvanian*, July 6, 1844; *North American*, July 6, 1844; *Public Ledger*, July 6, 1844; *United States Gazette*, July 6, 1844; *Native American*, July 24, 1844; *Catholic Herald*, July 11, 1844.
91. Thomas J. Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884*, (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1884), I, 669, n. 1; Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 161; *Pennsylvanian*, July 6, 1844; *Tremendous Riots in Southwark* (Philadelphia: John B. Perry, 1844), p. 2; *New York Freeman's Journal*, July 27, 1844.
92. *Tremendous Riots in Southwark*, pp. 6, 35; *The Olive Branch or, An Earnest Appeal in Behalf of Religion, the Supremacy of Law, and Social Order: With Documents Relating to the Late Disturbances in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: M. Fithian, 1844), pp. 39-40; *Presbyterian*, July 13, 1844; *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), July 12, 1844; *United States Gazette*, July 6, 8, 1844; *Germantown Telegraph*, July 10, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, July 9, 1844; *Pennsylvania Freeman*, July 18, 1844.
93. *The Olive Branch*, pp. 41-42; *Catholic Herald*, July 11, 25, August 1, 1844; *New York Freeman's Journal*, July 13, 1844; *United States Gazette*, July 9, 19, 20, 25, 1844; *Catholic Eyewitness*, p. 60; *Philadelphia Ledger*, July 24, 1844; *Philadelphia Gazette*, July 9, 19, 1844; *Tremendous Riots in Southwark*, pp. 10-11; *Germantown Telegraph*, July 10, 24, 1844; *Pennsylvanian*, July 8, 10, 17, 26, 1844; *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), August 2, 1844; Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 175; *North American*, July 9, 1844; *Native American*, July 10, 1844; *Saturday Courier*, July 13, 1844; Governor David Porter's Annual Message to the Legislature, *Senate Journal of Pennsylvania*, I, January 8, 1845, 21-23. In his message, Porter stated: "On the origin of these riotous proceedings I do not feel called upon to make any particular animadversions" (p. 16).

There are no extant sources that state the exact number of persons killed or wounded in the riots. From reading a number of different accounts, however, the following approximate figures may be used as indicative of the actual number of lives lost in the riots. During the May riots, one Catholic and at least thirteen nativists were slain while over forty nativists were wounded. Most of the slain nativists

were probably killed early on the first day of the riots when Catholics temporarily held the upper hand. During the July riots, at least thirty nativists and more than fourteen soldiers lost their lives and as many as a hundred others were wounded in the fierce fighting that took place between the rioters and the military. Thus both for the May and July riots, conservative estimates indicate that about forty-five people were killed and about a hundred and forty more were wounded. Nor are there any specific figures for the amount of property damage sustained during the riots. A reasonable guess would indicate that property damage and destruction (including the burning of churches and private homes) amounted to between \$300,000 and \$500,000.

94. *United States Gazette*, July 11, 1844; *Pennsylvania Freeman*, July 18, August 1, 1844; *Banner of the Cross*, July 18, 27, 1844; *Presbyterian*, July 13, 1844; *Christian Observer* (Philadelphia), July 12, 19, 1844.
95. *Catholic Herald*, July 18, 1844. Cf. *Spirit of the Times*, quoted in the *Catholic Herald*, August 29, 1844.
96. *Philadelphia Gazette*, July 8, 9, 1844; *Native American*, July 10, 1844; *Daily Sun*, July 11, 1844; *Pennsylvanian*, July 9, 11, 1844; *New York Freeman's Journal*, July 13, 1844; *Public Ledger*, July 11, 1844; *United States Gazette*, July 15, 1844; *Germantown Telegraph*, July 10, 1844.
97. *Philadelphia Gazette*, July 11, 12, 1844; Charles Binney, *The Life of Horace Binney with Selections from His Letters* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1903), pp. 239-40; *Pennsylvanian*, July 12, 13, 1844; *North American*, July 12, 1844; *United States Gazette*, July 12, 1844; *Native American*, July 13, 1844. Cf. *Journal of the Select and Common Councils of Philadelphia, 1843-1844*, X, July 18, 1844, 131-32; *Philadelphia Gazette*, July 11, 13, 1844.
98. *Catholic Herald*, July 25, 1844; *Daily Sun*, July 17, 1844; *North American*, July 24, 1844.
99. *Daily Sun*, July 17, 1844; *North American*, July 24, 1844; *Christian Advocate and Journal*, August 21, 1844; George Peck, "The Literary Policy of the Romish Church," *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, XXVI (July 1844), 360; *Minutes of the 137th Anniversary of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1844* (Philadelphia: King and Baird, 1844), pp. 3-4; *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (1838-1858)* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1894), p. 173.
100. Samuel F. B. Morse, *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States* (New York: Leavitt, Lord and Co., 1835), p. 51.
101. Neil McCluskey, *Public Schools and Moral Education* (New York: Columbia University, 1958), p. 48.

102. Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Immigrant in American History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1948), p. 122.
103. Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938), pp. 157-58.
104. Francis Kenrick, "Girard College," *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, III (April 1849), 174. Cf. Francis Kenrick to Orestes Brownson, Philadelphia, January 25, 1849, Kenrick Collection (in the Philadelphia Archdiocesan Archives, photostat from University of Notre Dame Archives). This letter includes Kenrick's revisions for his article on Girard College. Cf. *Catholic Herald*, February 15, 1844.
105. *Catholic Herald*, quoted by the *Banner of the Cross*, July 27, 1844. Cf. *Catholic Herald*, January 19, February 16, 1843; Richard Whelan to Francis Kenrick, Richmond, March 29, 1843, Kenrick Papers (in the Archdiocesan Archives of Baltimore), 32 J 2; Samuel Eccleston to Francis Kenrick, Baltimore, March 31, 1843, *ibid.*, 27 A M 7. Both these letters concern a Catholic army lieutenant up for court martial for refusing to lead his men to Protestant church services. In 1845, Kenrick wrote a letter of thanks to Commodore J. D. Elliott for allowing Catholic naval personnel to be excused from Protestant services at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Cf. Francis Kenrick to J. D. Elliott, Philadelphia, February 7, 1845, *Letter Ledger*, p. 224. In this letter, there is reference to previous correspondence on the subject.
106. James A. Burns, *The Principles, Origin and Establishment of the Catholic School System in the United States* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1912), p. 261.
107. *Catholic Herald*, March 4, 9, 1843. Kenrick made it clear that his suggestion for a nonreligious public education arose from "despair" of receiving public funds for religious schools.
108. A Plenary Council represents "several ecclesiastical provinces—ordinarily under one civil Government, and therefore sometimes called National.' A National Council is assembled by the express direction of the Sovereign Pontiff, who appoints an Apostolic Delegate to preside over the assembly in his name. Three National or Plenary Councils of the American Church were held in Baltimore, in 1852, 1866, and 1884." Peter K. Guilday (ed.), *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy (1792-1919)* (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Council, 1923), p. xi. Kenrick viewed the purpose of the Council as follows: "The object for which this Council is summoned, is by wise enactments and measures to promote discipline, and enforce the sacred Canons, or to submit such modifications of them as local circumstances may require, to the mature and enlightened judgment of the chief bishop, who is divinely charged with the solicitude of all the churches. We come together, brethren, not for idle display of ceremonial pomp, but to take mutual counsel after imploring divine guidance, for we watch, 'as being to render an ac-

- count of your souls.' The power committed to us by our Lord is to be exercised for edification, for the building up of the body of Christ, whose members should be closely joined together in religious communion." *Ibid.*, p. 180. In a letter to Bishop John Purcell of Cincinnati, Kenrick discussed the questions to be dealt with at the Council. Francis Kenrick to John Purcell, Baltimore, December 21, 1851, Kenrick Collection (in the Philadelphia Archdiocesan Archives, photostat from University of Notre Dame Archives).
109. The manuscript of this essay is in the Kenrick Papers (in the Archdiocesan Archives of Baltimore). The paper is not dated, though on one page is a notation by Bishop Martin Spalding of Louisville that the paper was presented for printing. A perfectionist, Kenrick made a great many revisions to the initial draft.
 110. *Concilium Plenarium Totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, Baltimori Habitum anno 1852* (Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1853), p. 87; Guilday, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-91. "In urging on you the discharge of this duty," declared the pastoral in further justification, "we are acting on the suggestion of the Sovereign Pontiff, who in an encyclical letter, dated 21 November, 1851, called on all the Bishops of the Catholic world, to provide for the Christian education of youth. We are following the example of the Irish Hierarchy, who are courageously opposing the introduction of a system based on the principle which we condemn. . . ."
 111. For a detailed discussion of these efforts, see Austin Flynn, "The School Controversy in New York, 1840-1842, and Its Effect on the Formulation of Catholic Elementary Policy" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, 1962), pp. 193-226. As archbishop of Baltimore, Kenrick sought public funds for his Catholic schools. Cf. Sister Mary St. Patrick McConville, *Political Nativism in the State of Maryland, 1830-1860* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1928).